



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Bt. from Commis




800041092M

W. J. Parkyn

from  
Miss Parn  
Lancaster.

19039 e 115.





10

11



# ISRAEL'S WANDERINGS;

OR,

*The Scythz, the Saxons, and the Rymry:*

A CONNECTED ACCOUNT,

TRACING THE LOST TRIBES OF ISRAEL INTO THE  
BRITISH ISLES.

BY

OXONIAN.

*ILLUSTRATED BY MAPS.*

---

**Second Edition.**

---

LONDON:  
JOHN HEYWOOD, 11, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS.

1885.

PRINTED BY R. FOLKARD AND SON,  
22, DEVONSHIRE STREET, QUEEN SQUARE, BLOOMSBURY,  
LONDON, W.C.



## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION .....	I
PART I.—THE REMNANT THAT ESCAPED.	
<i>CHAPTER I.—EARLY MARITIME ENTERPRISE OF ISRAEL.</i>	
Mention of the Navy of Dan before the Trojan War—Dan and the Danaï—Danaus—Dan and Javan—Heracles and the Heraclidæ—The Argonauts—Cognizances—Dan at Troy—The early Greek Confederacies—The Sibyl—The Lacedæmonians, B.C. 180, recognised by the Jewish High Priest as fellow-Israelites. ....	9
<i>CHAPTER II.—THE CANAANITES AND THE KELTS.</i>	
Canaan's Curse—"Thorns in your side"—Early Colonization of the Shores of the Mediterranean by Canaanites—They penetrate into the Interior—The "Keltic" Race composed of Canaanites and Israelites—Evidence of, 1. Race-Divisions; 2. Race-Names; 3. Tradition and History; 4. Manners and Customs; 5. Language; 6. Names of Places—Points of Resemblance between Kelts and Saxons. ....	14
<i>CHAPTER III.—DAN AND SIMEON IN THE ISLES OF THE WEST.</i>	
The Tuatha de Dannan—Why did Dan remain in Ships?—Escape of Dan and Simeon from Palestine—The Milesians or Scots—Zedekiah's Daughters; Jeremiah, and Baruch—The Princess from the East, the Prophet, and Simon Brug—David's Throne Perpetual—The Kymry or Belgæ—The Britons—Settlement of the Scots in Argyll—Early Missionary Ardour of the Scots in Ireland. B.C. 770 to A.D. 300. ....	24
<i>CHAPTER IV.—KYMERIC ISRAEL AMONG THE GENTILES.</i>	
Micah's Prophecy—First Historical Movements of the Kelts—The Kymry advance on Rome—Battle of the Allia—The Kymry enter Galatia, and gradually become a terror to the neighbouring States—The Galatians converted to Christianity—Taken as Prisoners to the North-West Shore of the Black Sea. B.C. 700 to A.D. 267. ....	32
PART II.—THE TRIBES OF THE CAPTIVITY.	
<i>CHAPTER V.—THE SCENE OF THE CAPTIVITY.</i>	
The Captivities of Israel—"Habor, which is Cabul"—Harran, Gauzanitis, and the Khabûr—The Boundaries of Assyria—The Chebar—The River Gozan—Hara, Habor, and Halah—The Cities of the Medes. B.C. 740 to 714. ....	39
<i>CHAPTER VI.—THE ESCAPE OF ISRAEL INTO EUROPE.</i>	
Ammi, and Lo-ammi—Beth Khumri, Beth I-saac and S'coth-ites—Ï-tsahak or Tsahak—Two Independent Witnesses—The narrow passages of the Euphrates—Ar-sareth—The Sereth—Revolt of the Medes—The Scûths cross the Araxes, and reach the "Kimmerian Land"—The Kimmerians. B.C. 714 to 654... ..	45

**CHAPTER VII.—THE SAXONS OF THE EAST.**

An Offshoot of Israel to the East—"The Saxons of the East and the West"  
 —The Scüthic Sakai—Saca-Suni—The Parthian Empires—Buddhism—  
 Sakya Muni—Confucius—Absorption Impossible for Wandering Israel—  
 The Sakhs in India—The Afghan Beni-Israel—The Broken Link Found. 57

**CHAPTER VIII.—TREADING DOWN AND TEARING IN PIECES.**

Scüths and Kimmerians—Chronology—The Kimmerians in Lydia—The  
 Scüths in Media—Both Expelled—Israel on the Black Sea. B.C. 654 to  
 600. ... .. 65

**CHAPTER IX.—ISRAEL SETTLED ON THE BLACK SEA.**

No King—Darius invades Scüthia—The Gétai—Zal-moxis—Darius retires  
 —Tar-gitau—Visit of Herodotus to Scüthia—His Information: 1, Geo-  
 graphy of Scüthia; 2, Language; 3, National Character; 4, Manners and  
 Customs—Scüthic Corn-trade—The Getæ north of the Danube—Immi-  
 gration of Galatians into Scüthia. B.C. 600 to 115. ... .. 69

**CHAPTER X.—FIRST MIGRATION WEST—THE KIMBRI.**

The Getæ in Roumania—B.C. 113—The Kimbri—The name identical  
 with that of the Kimmerians—Advance up the Danube and the Drave—  
 Battle of Noreia—The Kimbri pass through Switzerland—Battles in S.  
 Gaul—Battles of Arausio—Three great victories almost in one day—The  
 Kimbri South of the Pyrenees—They ravage Gaul—Combine with the  
 Teutons to invade Italy—Battle on the Adige—Marius. B.C. 114 to 100. 77

**CHAPTER XI.—SECOND MIGRATION WEST—ARMINIUS.**

Scüthai and Guthai, S'coth and Goth—The Cherusci—Later a part of the  
 Saxons—Arminius—Defeat of Varus in the Battle of the Saltus Teutober-  
 gensis—The Khatti—Hessians, or Hittites—Germanicus—Death of  
 Arminius—First mention of the name "Saxons"—German Religion—  
 Who were the Goths?—Dan and the Danes—Assyrians and Medes.  
 B.C. 100 to A.D. 150. ... .. 84

**CHAPTER XII.—THIRD MIGRATION WEST—ODIN.**

The later Scüthia—The Dakians—Irruption of the Scüths into Moesia—  
 Dekebal—Trajan—The Dakians retire to the country between the Car-  
 pathians and the Dniepr—Israelitish gravestones in the Crimea—Odin—  
 An historical character—Anglo-Saxon genealogies—Odin's date—Odin a  
 Scüth—Led a large mass of Scüths from Åsgard on the Dniepr into  
 Western Germany—This movement pressed the Germans on the Roman  
 Empire—Odin in Saxony—In Sweden—Scüthia and Swithiod—Death  
 of Odin. B.C. 10 to A.D. 260. ... .. 93

**CHAPTER XIII.—ISRAEL SETTLED ON THE GERMAN OCEAN.**

Sudden increase of the Saxon power after the date of Odin's arrival—  
 Saxons, Kimbri, and Jutes or Goths—Angles—Danes—Maximin—Naval  
 enterprise of the Franks and Saxons—The Saxons help Carausius, a  
 British usurper of the Imperial power—Great power of the Saxons  
 towards the close of the Fourth Century—The Saxons: their (1) Lan-  
 guage, (2) National Character, (3) Manners and Customs—The religion  
 of Odin. A.D. 260 to 400. ... .. 102

**CHAPTER XIV.—THE MIGRATIONS OF ISRAEL INTO BRITAIN.**

The Romans abandon Britain—Hengist and Horsa—First Saxon Settle-  
 ment in Britain—Saxon Octarchy—The Danes—Scots, Kymry, Saxons—  
 The Anglo-Saxons were not Germans—The "Teutonic" Theory—The  
 Scandinavian question. A.D. 400 to 900. ... .. 111

## PART III. ISRAEL UNITED.

*CHAPTER XV.—BENJAMIN.*

Benjamin—Prophesied character—Lent to Judah—Jeremiah's prophetic warning—Zechariah's prophecy—Benjamin received Christ—Christian Benjamin escaped the siege of Jerusalem—The early Asiatic churches—Benjamin and the Galatians... .. 119

*CHAPTER XVI.—THE NORMANS.*

Benjamin and the Galatians carried captive to the N.W. of the Black Sea—They crossed over the continent to N. W. Germany, or more probably got round to the Saxon settlements by ship—The Normans of A.D. 1066—"Northmen"—The Norman character. A.D. 267 to 1066. ... .. 124

*CHAPTER XVII.—ISRAEL IN BRITAIN.*

Britain freed from its French dominions—Formation of the British Nation—Fighting against great odds—Israel's political destiny finally worked out—Ephraim and Manasseh—Manasseh in America—Joseph's blessings—Conclusion. ... .. 127

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY ... .. 135

NOTE ON THE DATE OF SAKYA-MUNI (BUDDHA) ... .. 144

## APPENDIX.

I.—DAN OMITTED FROM THE SEALING OF THE 144,000 OF ALL THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL ... .. 147

II.—THE RIVER ARAXES OF HERODOTUS ... .. 151

III.—THE RELIGION OF ODIN, FROM THE EDDA AND THE VÖLUSPA 154

## M A P S.

THE WANDERINGS OF DAN ... .. To face Page 9

ISRAEL'S CAPTIVITY ... .. " 39

MAP ILLUSTRATING 2 ESDRAS } ... .. " 45

MAP ILLUSTRATING HERODOTUS } ... .. " 45

SCÜTH-LAND, ILLUSTRATING ISRAEL'S ESCAPE INTO EUROPE ... .. " 65


THE SCÜTHIC MIGRATIONS FROM ARSARETH TO BRITAIN ... .. " 77

## ERRATA.


---

p.	22,	l.	3,	26,	read	Phoenician.
"	26	"	5		"	<i>daughters;</i>
"	29	"	37		"	<i>era.</i>
"	30	"	33		"	<i>era.</i>
"	40	"	3		"	<i>B.C. 714.</i>
"	45	"	3		"	<i>Scythians.</i>
"	47	"	31		"	<i>training (for, education).</i>
"	48	"	14		"	<i>corroborative.</i>
"	75	"	14		"	<i>Scythia.</i>
"	75	"	39		"	<i>Dakians.</i>
"	76	"	33		"	<i>Dakians.</i>
"	78	"	36		"	<i>Kimbrians.</i>
"	79	"	4		"	<i>Kimbri.</i>
no	xxx	"	5		"	<i>The Anglo-Saxons were not Germans. instead of, No Anglo-Saxons left in Germany.</i>

# INTRODUCTION.







## INTRODUCTION.

---

**I**N presenting to the reader a series of chapters, purporting to give a connected history of the movements of our forefathers, during a period of more than a thousand years before the first Saxon settlement was formed in Britain, I am fully aware that my attempt must seem most futile, and that it calls for a very definite explanation. Following the example of the small number of historians who, like Sharon Turner, have endeavoured to piece together the fragmentary information attainable as to the early history of the British race, the only ground on which I pretend to be more successful than they were is that I have been able to avail myself of a new light, in which to read the records of a past which, otherwise, is hidden in obscurity. During the last ten years a belief has been gradually spreading throughout the length and breadth of the land, that we, the British Nation, are of the favoured stock of Abraham, the "Friend of God"—none other, indeed, than the "Lost Tribes" of Israel. There are those, who, wise perhaps in their own conceit, have allowed the seeming absurdity which prevails with many from a first momentary consideration of this idea, to blind them to any subsequent investigations. But it is the province alike of the candid opponent, as of the enthusiastic supporter, of a startling theory to examine all the facts bearing upon the case; in the present instance, to examine all the data from which the early history of our nation may be derived, and to see if hitherto unexplained facts receive a real significance when viewed in the light of the new theory.

However, as the real basis on which this supposed Identity rests is the correspondence between facts of modern history and the future prophesied in Holy Scripture for the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, I will ask the reader to bear with me, while I set forth in a few words the nature of this evidence.

The first passage I will notice contains a wonderful revelation of the intentions of Jehovah as to the future history of the world, a considerable time even before Abraham was born. In Deut. xxxii. 8, 9, we read in the inspired song of Moses, that "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, *He set the bounds of the people\* according to the number of the children of Israel.* For the Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot (*i.e.*, measuring line, cord, or girdle) of His inheritance." In this passage we have the world mapped out beforehand, so to speak, with a view to the gradual spreading of God's chosen people, long before their national existence had begun. Bearing this in mind, let us study the promises of multitudinous increase given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, over and over again, *without the slightest condition attached to them*; the inspired predictions of Jacob and Moses as to the future of the different tribes, especially those sprung from Joseph—again with no conditions; also the chapter in Leviticus (xxvi.) where the *conditional* blessings and curses are detailed, and where yet God declares His intention to be favourable to His people, even when they shall have broken the conditions; for the conclusion is, "Yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, neither will I abhor them to destroy them utterly, and *to break My covenant with them.* But I will for their sakes remember *the covenant of their ancestors.*" Let us consider the natural jealousy between Ephraim and the other tribes, on account of the heirship of the temporal promises belonging to the former; and we shall understand the cause of the frequent dissensions which continued up to the final division of the kingdom. The distinction between Judah and (the rest of) Israel occurs in thirty-three passages prior to the date of the final rupture. Constantly it happened that there was a confederation, under the lead of Ephraim, in opposition to Judah, the other prominent tribe. This was the human means which produced

\* The rendering should be *peoples*, according to the original עַמִּים—C. M.

the severance of Israel from Judah. "It was from the Lord." He was employing the human weaknesses of His people, in order to work out *His design for bringing the world into subjection by means of one nation chosen for that purpose from the beginning of the world's history*. The separate captivity of Israel, earlier by more than a century than that of Judah, was part of the same all-wise plan. The discussion raised as to whether any of the captivity of Israel returned to Palestine with the Jews, after the edict of Cyrus, is entirely irrelevant; for even if it could be proved that this was the case, numberless prophecies still recognise the separate existence of the Nation of Israel, with a future entirely different from that foretold for Judah, as continuing until the glorious restoration of both to their land, never to be rooted out again. The Jews definitively brought the curses upon themselves by rejecting Christ with the cry, "His blood be upon us and on our children." The Ten Tribes, being the main mass of the Hebrew Nation, were not in the land to share in this crowning crime, and undoubtedly the promises made by God to the patriarchs, confirmed to the Hebrew nation, and reiterated by the prophets, when the prospects of Israel were to all appearance the most unpromising—those promises would begin to take effect at some period in the history of the Nation of Israel, the Ten Tribes, not the Two. The prophecies bearing on this point are too numerous for me to do anything but ask the reader to begin at the beginning of the prophets and go carefully through, noticing the different points for himself. But there is one prophecy which I must discuss at some length. It is the view of the future history of the world, from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to the very end, which is given in the Prophecy of Daniel. Four empires are there portrayed as succeeding one another in the supremacy of the world. These four are all literal temporal empires, and are all readily identified. The fifth and last empire, which replaces all these, is generally understood merely of the spiritual kingdom of Christ. Such a mode of interpretation is not only arbitrary, but also, in the present instance, it does not agree with the details of the prophecy. The growth of the spiritual kingdom of Christ only began with the Advent of our Blessed Saviour Himself. *The growth of the Fifth Empire of Daniel was to commence with the first of the Four, and to continue through them all.* It is this which

renders it impossible that Daniel's Last Empire is confined to the spiritual kingdom of Christ. In its earlier stages at least it must be a temporal empire, just like the other four—none other than the empire of God's chosen people Israel, His destined instrument for the subjection of the whole earth.

In the light of these considerations, how can the unique position of the British Nation and Empire be accounted for, except on the supposition that it is the Nation and Empire of the seed of Abraham? Certain it is that this Nation fulfils at the present day the destined rôle of Israel. This can only be due to the fact that Israel is in Britain; no other nation can have stepped into the promises entailed by God on Israel, for God cannot lie.

My object in adding another to the already large number of writings on this question is briefly this. Some of the pamphlets contain statements affecting matters of race and language which seem of the wildest nature, because they are not presented in a connected view, showing the possibility or probability of each distinct step. What I have done has been to examine these disconnected statements, and to see if they are possible or reasonable when placed in a connected series. I cannot help feeling that in this I have succeeded beyond my utmost expectations; starting with but little material as groundwork—a few ideas suggested in a way other than as the result of my own thinking—I have been permitted to work out a connected account of the Wanderings of the Lost Tribes between Palestine and Britain, which will at least show the possibility, historical and ethnological, of our Identity with Israel. Some parts may seem less probable than others. Different readers may realize the truth of different portions of the history. If any find their doubts in a way to be removed by anything I have written in these pages, I shall be well rewarded.

A few words of explanation are necessary as to my reason for making no reference to the ordinary language of comparative philology, in dealing with questions of race and language. In the first place, the theory on which philology has been resting hitherto—namely, that language is a certain test of race—has been entirely cut away by the recent declarations of eminent philologists, that *language is only a sure test of social contact*. This proposition, self-evident when once laid down, had been left unnoticed until quite recently, and

until works on philology shape themselves according to this newly-discovered but certainly true rule, it is but lost labour to perplex the mind with the different speculations of individual philological authorities. Taking philology as it is generally understood, it comes into contact with more than one fact which believers in revelation will accept as true. Thus, Canaan was really a son of Ham ; but the philologist calls the Canaanites a Semitic race. The Bible tells us of a time when all the nations of the earth spoke one language ; philology points to an original "Aryan" tongue, an original "Semitic" tongue, and pretends to find no unity in all the other languages of the world, while these supposed divisions of the human race do not resemble the divisions accomplished by the Confusion of Tongues. Believing that there is no *known* fact in the sciences of race and language which is violated by the supposition that the British belong to the Hebrew race, I will forthwith, without any further preface, introduce the reader to his subject.





## PART I.




THE REMNANT THAT ESCAPED.











## CHAPTER I.

### EARLY MARITIME ENTERPRISE OF ISRAEL.

*Mention of the Navy of Dan before the Trojan War—Dan and the Danai—Danaus—Dan and Javan—Heracles and the Heraclidae—The Argonauts—Cognizances—Dan at Troy—The early Greek Confederacies—The Sibyl—The Lacedæmonians, B.C. 180, recognized by the Jewish High Priest as fellow-Israelites.*

**F**EW who attempt to piece together the early history of the eastern shores of the Mediterranean take into consideration the possible part played in it by the Hebrew race; yet the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites under Joshua occurred in B.C. 1503,\* more than 300 years before the date usually assigned to the siege of Troy. Are we, therefore, to suppose that, during the early centuries of their occupation of the land of Canaan, the Israelites formed no acquaintance with the sea which formed their western boundary? This question is settled by the consideration of one fact. About B.C. 1300, the Tribal Nation was threatened with invasion, coming as the punishment of one of their ever-recurring relapses into idolatry. Jehovah, ever merciful to the people of His inheritance, delivered them by the hand of Deborah and Barak; but the tribe of Dan was singled out for rebuke for "getting on board his ships." *Here, then, is distinct mention of the possession of a navy, by a section of the Israelites, more than a century before the Trojan war.*

It is the opinion of the learned ethnologist, Dr. Latham,† "that the eponymus of the Argive Danai was no other than that of the Israelite tribe of Dan; only we are so used to confine ourselves to the soil of Palestine in our consideration of the Israelites, that we treat them as if they were *adscripti glebæ*, and ignore the share they

\* Reckoned from the true date of the Exodus, which is, demonstrably, B.C. 1543.

† "Ethnology of Europe," p. 157; cited in *Dan, the Pioneer of Israel*, by Col. Gawler.

may have taken in the ordinary history of the world. The sea-ports between Tyre and Ascalon, of Dan, Ephraim, and Ashur, must have followed the history of sea-ports in general, and not have stood on the coast for nothing. What a light would be thrown on the origin of the name Peloponnesus and the history of the *Pelop-id* family, if a *bonâ-fide* nation of *Pelopes*, with unequivocal affinities and contemporary annals, had existed on the coast of Asia! Who would have hesitated to connect the two? Yet with the Danai and the Tribe of Dan this *is* the case, and no one connects them!" Now it is certain that the early traditions of Greece told of the immigration of a colony led by *Danaus from Egypt*; and, in the light of the previous remarks, it is not too much to say that this "myth" embodies the fact of the association in early times of Dan with Greece. We are not without further Scriptural evidence of the reality of this fact; for Ezekiel\* tells us that "*Dan also and Favan going to and fro occupied in the fairs*" of Tyre. Javan is the regular Biblical designation for Greece; and this passage is probably the only reference in the Bible to what is known in profane history as the colonization of the shores of the Mediterranean by Phœnicians and Greeks.

A theory, which at the present day is gaining considerable ground amongst the learned, is that the Greek mythology came originally from Phœnicia; and in this light we may consider several striking facts brought forward by Colonel Gawler, in his pamphlet entitled *Dan, the Pioneer of Israel*.† These, in his own words, are as follows:—"Argos is said by the Greeks to have been the birth-place of Hercules, but Herodotus, who went to some trouble to find out who Hercules really was, made a special voyage to Tyre (ii. 44), and found an older temple to Hercules. The origin of the Grecian Hercules, or rather *Heracles* as it is in Greek, seems to me to have been in the daring adventures and exploits of the semi-traders and buccaniers of Tyre and Dan, out of which they formed an ideal man‡ suitable to that heroic age, and in apparent conformity with the earliest Divine command (Gen. i. 26, 28) to "subdue" and "have dominion." In Hebrew *rakal* means to *trade*, and *Heracleem* means traders. . . . *Argos* also, from *ragos*, to move, is Hebrew for "a portable chest," a name which might well symbolise *trade* or *commerce*. And the reputed mother of Heracles, *Alcmene* (whose name is sometimes applied to Minerva, goddess of *Science*) seems likely to

\* xxvii. 19.

† p. 15.

‡ The real origin of Heracles was Samson, the mighty hero of the Tribe of Dan (Judges xiii. 25).—C. M.

be the Hebrew *chymeh*, heat or warmth, as a producing or loosening power, with the particle *al*, as in Arabic, *Alchymy*. And this seems the more probable, as this Alcmenē was said to be the daughter of *Electryon*, derived from the Greek word for *amber*, by rubbing which, *electric* sparks are produced; known certainly to Thales, a so-called Phœnician, *circa* 600 B.C. But the Greek word *elektron* seems derived from the Hebrew *keter*, to *fume*, to *make to smoke*; as a noun, vapour, incense (for which *amber*, which gives a pungent, aromatic smoke, was largely used), also with the particle *al*. The foundation of the whole may be, that at Thebes in Bœotia, the adopted country of Cadmus the Phœnician, was a college of *science*, Alcmenē, which the aspiring young Danites, sons of the enterprising *traders*, or Heracleem of Argos, called their *mother*. . . . Those who went forth from Argos, and subdued other parts of Greece, are spoken of as *Heraclidæ*, or descendants of Heracles."

These considerations go far to lift the veil from that event, which is recorded in Greek traditions as preceding the Trojan war—the expedition of the Argonauts. The Thessalians, who manned the *Argo*, were, through Thessalus, the supposed founder of their race, Heraclidæ, Heracleem, or traders of the Tribe of Dan. Sailing through the narrow passage of the Bosphorus, these hardy sailors penetrated to the eastern shore of the Black Sea, where they founded the colony of Colchis. As, therefore, in this exploit of early Grecian enterprise, there is strong reason for believing that the principal part was played by Israelites, so it is also probable that this was the case generally in Greek expeditions previous to 1000 B.C. It is most improbable that the Greeks, whose flourishing period was so much later, should have been so vigorous in the early period which we are considering. It is not merely identity of name between the Tribe of Dan and the Danai of Greece which gives support to this supposition. In the work before referred to, Col. Gawler has traced the most marvellous connection between them in the matter of their national cognizances; the *serpent* and the *eagle* are intimately connected with both. It is also noticeable that of all the names by which Homer calls the besiegers of Troy, Danai is the only one which does not occur in later times as a Greek appellation. This strongly confirms the present supposition as to the origin of the name.

There are other facts which point to the introduction of an Israelitish element into Greece, in the so-called mythical period of Greek history. The original Ionian confederation on the Asiatic side of the Ægean numbered *twelve* cities, founded according to

chronologists 140 years after the Trojan War, *i.e.*, in the fifth century, after the settlement of Israel on the shores of the Mediterranean. Again, further north, on the same coast, there was an early confederation of Æolians—here also were *twelve* cities—the date of their origin being stated as a considerable number of years earlier, but still after the Trojan War. “It seems to me,” says Herodotus, “that the number twelve was chosen by the Ionians, and that they were unwilling to exceed this number, because, when they dwelt in Peloponnese, there also they had twelve divisions. So too, in my time, there are twelve divisions of the Achæans, who drove out the Ionians.”\* But whence did the Ionians in the Peloponnese get the number, and the Æolians, in whose case Herodotus offers no explanation? The number is distinctly Israelitish, and one which Israelites at all times clung to as the symbol of the united nation, and its prominence in the early Greek history, added to the previous considerations, cannot but be regarded as most significant; the more so when it is borne in mind that Cume, the most important city of the Æolic confederation, was the traditional home of the Sibylline “oracles,” which many have supposed to have been of Hebrew origin. Indeed, the name of the Sibyl in Hebrew (*Shibul*, “an ear of corn,” plur. *Shibboleth* or *Sibboleth*) “points probably,” thinks a writer on freemasonry, “to the idea of *Virgo* presiding over the harvest; while Egypt was her original home, whence she passed through the cities of the Grecian isles to the shores of Italy.”†

Evidence, then, the most varied supports the supposition of an early connection between Israel and the different tribes of Greece. A trace of such a connection was found in the traditional account of the Heraclidæ. From them the Israelitish element would be traced on the one hand through the early rulers of Argos to the kings of Macedon and Alexander the Great, on the other hand, to the governing class at Sparta—the Lacedæmonians; and here the series of mere probabilities passes off into something more certain, for it is recorded in the first book of the Maccabees‡ that, about B.C. 180, the following letter was received by the High Priest at Jerusalem:—

“*Areus, King of the Lacedæmonians, to Onias, the High Priest, sendeth greeting. It is found in writing that the Lacedæmonians and Jews are brethren, and that they are the stock of Abraham.*”

\* Bk. I. 145.

† Fellows' *Mysteries of Freemasonry*, p. 87.

‡ Chap. xii.

A careful and thorough examination of the early Greek legends, unbiassed by the hack solar-myth theory of a certain class of writers at the present day, would no doubt result in the discovery of many confirmations of the idea suggested in this chapter. But little more is needed to show conclusively that the early enterprise in the Mediterranean and Euxine seas was largely due to the energy of Israelites of the Tribe of Dan; that their voyages were by no means insignificant, but extended to distant parts; and, therefore, that the supposition that at a later period the Dan-ite expeditions were conducted on a still larger scale is the very reverse of improbable.





## CHAPTER II.

### THE CANAANITES AND THE KELTS.

*Canaan's Curse—"Thorns in your sides"—Early Colonization of the Shores of the Mediterranean by the Canaanites—They penetrate into the Interior—The "Keltic" Race composed of Canaanites and Israelites—Evidence of, 1. Race-Divisions; 2. Race-Names; 3. Tradition and History; 4. Manners and Customs; 5. Language; 6. Names of Places—Points of Resemblance between Kelts and Saxons.*

**T** is a common habit to talk of the "curse upon Ham," and to point to Negro slavery as the natural and necessary outcome of this curse. *But there never was such a curse pronounced; the curse was upon Canaan*, one branch only of Ham's descendants. The passage runs thus:\* "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be servant to them. God shall enlarge Japheth, and shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be servant to them." Thus we must expect to find the Canaanites from time to time in subjection to, or employed by, either a Japhetic or a Semitic race. A special command was given by God to the Israelites to exterminate the Canaanitish races of the land they were to occupy; they failed to do this, and this failure involved a special punishment, for God warned them, "then those which ye let remain shall be thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell."† This warning is repeated several times; therefore, where we find Lost Israel, there we must find the Canaanites, for it is only after the final glorious restoration to Palestine that the Canaanite shall cease to vex; also, conversely, where we discover nations of a Canaanitish origin, there we have made a decided advance towards the discovery of the lost sections of the Hebrew race.

\* Gen. ix. 25-27; the literal rendering, as given in Mr. Marriott's *Hora Prophetica*, p. 2.

† Num. xxxiii. 52-56.



Most writers on the identity of the British with Israel\* believe that the colonists of the British Isles, prior to the arrival of the Saxons, were partly Israelites, partly Canaanites. We will commence by considering whether the grounds for this belief are reasonable or the reverse.

It must be borne in mind that the Canaanites of Biblical language are the Phœnicians of profane history; but Phœnicians was the name given to them by the Greeks; Canaanites they called themselves, this name being common to the parent nation and to its great Carthaginian offshoot. The centuries immediately succeeding the period of Solomon and Hiram, about 1000 B.C., saw the gradual establishment of Canaanite colonies at every point of the Mediterranean coast—especially in Spain, even outside the Pillars of Hercules. About the year 850, Dido, the kinswoman of Jezebel's father-in-law Ethbaal, led a settlement from Tyre to seek a new home on the northern coast of Africa. This was the great Canaanite colony of Carthage. Here the Canaanites spread inland, and occupied a considerable tract of country, corresponding to the modern principality of Tunis. If this was the case with one settlement, *is it not likely that the case would have been the same in Spain*, where colonies were being formed during the course of several centuries? Ancient atlases actually give the southern part of Spain, the modern Andalusia, as so occupied—"Here the Phœnicians went for gold." Here was one strong inducement to the Canaanites not to confine their attention to the sea-coast, but to penetrate inland. *It is therefore by no means absurd to suppose that, after the ninth century before Christ, Spain and the neighbouring countries were gradually peopled by Canaanites and Israelites.* The earlier Iberian or Basque race always formed a considerable factor in the population, either in a pure state or half-merged by intermarriage with the others; but it is not at all impossible that *the population of Spain, Gaul, and part of the British Isles, at the period when those countries came into historical contact with the Romans and the Greeks, consisted mainly of those two factors—the descendants of the Phœnician colonists and of self-exiled Israelites.* This will account for the whole of the so-called "Keltic" race. The first consideration pointing to this seemingly presumptuous ethnological identification is found in the early settlements of the Phœnicians. The second is the fact that the eighth century B.C. was marked by a state of things which neces-

\* Israel of Samaria, that is. Ephraim-Israel as opposed to Judah-Israel. This meaning must be kept clearly distinct in the reader's mind from that which includes the Jews.

sarily added largely to the number of these settlements and their colonists. From 771 B.C., the date of the first invasion of Israel\* by Assyria, to 720, when the last remains of Israel were carried into captivity, the dread of invasion was a constant cause of alarm. This was a cause which affected Israel and Phœnicia equally; and it is violating all ordinary probability to suppose that the maritime portions of both did not make a virtue of necessity, and abandon their homes to seek their fortunes at the further end of the "Great Sea." But a statement so sweeping as that presented above requires evidence of the strongest possible nature. This evidence, I think, is given in the following series of considerations.

#### I.—RACE DIVISIONS.

The Hebrews and the Canaanites were, it must be remembered, two adjoining races, *speaking two distinct forms of the same language*. Authorities are agreed that the so-called Keltic race contained two equally plainly-marked divisions: one the Kelts proper, also called Gaels and Gauls; the other the Kymry or Belgæ. *These also spoke two distinct forms of the same language*. Thus, at the outset, there is a marked similarity of arrangement.

#### 2.—RACE NAMES.

Of these two branches of the "Keltic race," the names of one—the section most specially connected with the British Isles—are distinctly Israelitish. The kingdom of Israel, according to the Assyrian inscriptions, was known as Beth *Khumri*; the Belgæ of Britain were known as *Kymry*, a name preserved in Wales to the present day. Again, the Israelites, when exiled from their home, were to be "Wanderers among the Nations;" and this would be most graphically expressed by a name formed from the Hebrew *S'coth*, "booths" or "tents," the appropriate emblems of a long-unsettled nation. Now some of these same Keltic Kymry—those who settled first in North Ireland, and afterward in *Cumbria*—were known as *Scuit* or *Scoti*. In the opinion of Prof. Rawlinson, "Identity of name, even alone, is an argument which requires to be met, and which, unless met by positive objections, establishes a presumption in favour of a connection of race." Without going so far as this, it must be obvious that a *two-fold similarity of race name* is something more than a striking coincidence. In the present instance the posi-

\* See note \* on the preceding page.

tion is still stronger, for we shall find, when we come to trace the Tribes of the Captivity, that in the many different localities where there is reason to look for them at successive periods in the history these same names occur. This is a point which must be allowed its full weight. As regards the other division of the "Keltic" race, it seems certain that the name *Kelte* or *Galli*—respectively the Greek and Roman form of the same word—was properly applied to it, in contradistinction to the Belgae or Kymry; and, therefore, on the present supposition, would be a Canaanitish appellation. Probably *Gael* is the real form. Now *Gal* is a frequent element in local names throughout the country of the Canaanites and of Israel, as in Gal-aad, Gal-ilee, Gil-gal. Dean Stanley refers to the word *Gel-iloith*, "circles," as being used five times in Scripture; twice in the general sense of "coast" or "border," three times especially relating to the course of the Jordan, the valley of which was at one time the headquarters of the Canaanites inland. The twenty cities given by Solomon to Hiram, King of Tyre, were called *Galil*: they were also known as the "district of the Gentiles;" possibly, thinks Dean Stanley, from the number of Canaanites who remained unexpelled from the cities of that part of the country.\* In this way, Gael may easily have been a Canaanitish name, perhaps referring to their occupation of the sea-coast, but this must for the present remain less certain than the case of the Scoti and the Kymry.

### 3.—TRADITION AND HISTORY.

In addition to the facts mentioned above concerning the Phœnician colonies, and the causes which led to their multiplication, we have direct evidence, as will be seen in the next chapter, in the old Irish traditions bearing out the belief that a portion of the early colonists of Ireland were Israelites. We shall also see that in the subsequent history of the "Kelts," the Kymric branch exhibit the prophesied career of outcast Israel, while the Kelts proper fulfil the rôle destined for Canaan in serving both Shem and Japhet. Prof. Sullivan, a writer who has gone thoroughly into the Irish legends, uses the following striking language †:—"It was not irrational to attempt to connect the Irish with the Phœnicians when we consider that there is a strong, if not certain, evidence of considerable intercourse between the Mediterranean nations and the south-west of

\* *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 489.

† *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, by Prof. O'Curry, edited by Prof. W. K. Sullivan; Vol. I., p. 1.

Britain in times anterior to the rise of the Greek republics." There is only one consideration which, to the mind of this writer, "disposes for ever of the Phœnician origin of the Irish—viz., the fact universally admitted by comparative philologists, that '*Keltic is Aryan*.'"<sup>\*</sup> The worthlessness of this objection has been already discussed in the introductory chapter.

#### 4.—MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

The customs of the different branches of the "Kelts" directly support their Hebrew or Canaanitish origin. The number 12 is found constantly occurring. There were rulers over "companies" and over "hundreds." In Ireland and Wales, each kindred had an officer corresponding to the Hebrew "Avenger of blood," who arrested malefactors and brought them to justice. Mr. Mitchell, commenting on a dance referred to by the comedian Aristophanes, says "that it was a dance of old date seems certain. Palmer considers it the same as the *Spanish Saraband*, and derives it from the ancient Tyrians. In that case, it may be traced to that dance which appears to have concluded the religious repasts and festivities of the ancient Canaanites. 'The people sat down to eat and drink (viz., of the victims that had been offered in sacrifice), and rose up to dance.'"<sup>†</sup> This would require something more than the mere presence of a few Phœnician settlers on the Spanish sea-board.

Professor O'Curry adds unconscious testimony of a very striking character. Without the least attempt to account for it, he states that there certainly existed amongst the early colonisers of Ireland, "from a period contemporary with, if not anterior to, their original landing in the island,"<sup>†</sup> a system of law, in several points *similar to the ancient Hebrew Law*. This similarity is observable in the law of contracts (*service for debt*); also in the *requital of death with death*.<sup>‡</sup> *This Law* was actually said to be the *Mosaic Law*, a tradition also simply narrated without comment, but at the same time included among the trustworthy sources of early history, not among monkish fictions.§ The Druids are also discussed by the same authority, and traced to the East, with rites which can scarcely be explained except on the supposition of an Israelitish origin. On this point there is the following interesting passage in the historical work of Sharon Turner.|| "Of the Druidical superstitions we have no

\* p. lxviii.

§ pp. 182, 3.

† pp. 24—29.

|| Anglo-Saxons, p. 74.

‡ p. 20.

monuments remaining, unless the circles of stones, which are to be seen in some parts of the island, are deemed their temples. Of all the suppositions concerning Stonehenge and Avebury, it seems the most rational to ascribe them to the Druidical order; and of this system we may remark, that if it was the creation of a more civilized people, none of the colonisers of Britain are so likely to have been its parents as the Phœnicians and Carthaginians. . . . . *Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine abound with many solid rocks and stony mountains cut into shapes and excavated into chambers, and with erections of stones for the purposes of superstition.* Mr. Watts' Views in Syria and Palestine, from the drawings in Sir Robert Ainslie's collection, exhibit some curious remains of this sort." That the religion prevalent during the "Keltic" occupation of the British Isles was the Phœnician cult of Baalism, which proved the snare of Israel, is very clear—from the combined evidence of customs and names. "Till very recent times," says Professor Otté\*, "the country people in some parts of Ireland and Scotland, and even of England, had the custom of celebrating the return of midsummer-night on the 24th of June, by dancing together round a large fire lighted on some high hill, or running three times through the fire to secure the fulfilment of a wish. These midsummer-night dances, which were known in Britain as *Bel-tanes*, are nothing but the remains of an earlier form of Baal-worship."

#### 5.—LANGUAGE.

If the Kymric "Kelts" were Israelites who escaped the captivity, and who for centuries were in contact only with people speaking a language almost identical with that of Israel, their language should be a lineal descendant of Hebrew; on the other hand, the language of the Saxons should preserve traces of Hebrew origin, under a superstructure of Median and Assyrian words and inflexions. The evidence for the latter will be given later. That for the former is briefly as follows, being taken mainly from a pamphlet on the identity of the British with Israel.† "It is a remarkable fact that just as Latin was the language of the learned during the Middle Ages, and Sanskrit is that of the native scholars of Hindustan in the present day, so Hebrew appears to have been the language of the learned among the Cymry, down to a very late

\* Scandinavian History, p. 5.

† Are We Israelites? by the Rev. B. W. Savile, chap. vii.

period. Thus Taliesin, a celebrated bard of the ancient Britons, who was subsequently converted to Christianity, distinctly says, when speaking of his own songs, '*My lore has been declared in Hebrew, in the Hebraic tongue have I sung.*' . . . I would fain ask those who are opposed to Anglo-Israel views to consider how we are to account for this fact, that the language of the learned bards, in which their poetry was composed, and which must have had such an effect on the national mind, was the language of the House of Israel, if they had not been descended from some of those Tribes, who originally received it from the Hebrew patriarchs, and in which the books of Moses, and those of all the writers of the Old Testament were written."

To those who may desire to investigate the subject critically, I would recommend to their notice two small works entitled, *Our Vulgar Tongue*, by the late Canon Lysons, of Gloucester, and *The Affinity between the Hebrew Language and the Celtic*, by Dr. Thomas Stratton, of Edinburgh. An eminent Cornish scholar of the last century, who devoted much time to prove the affinity between the languages of the Israelites and the ancient Britons, observes:—"It would be difficult to adduce a single article or form of construction in the Hebrew grammar, but the same is to be found in Welsh, and there were many whole sentences in both languages exactly the same in the very words." The Kymric name for Jehovah is *I-a-vu-vo*. This may account for the name *Ievru* occurring on several inscriptions in Gaul, the meaning of which has been the subject of several discussions. Prof. Max Müller \* points out that "the Semitic languages are quite free from words beginning with two consonants without an intermediate vowel. This is a fact considered by Ewald as one of the prominent characters of the Semitic family. It seems that the Keltic nations were unable to pronounce an initial S before a consonant, or at least they disliked it." Now when we further consider that † "Old Irish was not pronounced like modern Irish . . . the Irish language was constantly undergoing changes;" we may fairly consider the Keltic languages as the lineal descendants of Hebrew and Phœnician; ‡ following a natural order of change through many centuries, but still at the end showing plainly their connection with the ancient tongues.

\* Lectures on the Science of Language, Series 2, p. 195.

† O'Curry, Preface to Vol. I., pp. 14, 15.

‡ Note also that the talk of the Phœnician slave in the *Penulus* of Plautus is intelligible when transliterated equally in Hebrew or Erse. Vide "Israel in Britain," p. 30.—C. M.

## 6.—NAMES OF PLACES.

Strong evidence of the occupation of the "Keltic" countries by Israelites and Canaanites is given by local names, as the following list will show. The names are taken from Keith Johnstone's *Royal Atlas*, and are arranged according to the probable Hebrew equivalents, which are mainly derived from the Appendix to Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*; S. stands for Scotland, I. for Ireland, E.-W. for England and Wales, and F. for France.

ACHU, 'meadow.' *Achu*-more (S.); *Accous*, *Acheux* (F.); *Achi*-l, *Achi*-ll (I.); *Acha*- occurs in 20 names (S.); *Ach*-in 22 (S.).

AIN, 'spring.' *Ain*-ort Loch (S.); *An*-dail Loch, *Ann* Burn, *Ann*-ack water, *Ann*-andale (S.); *An*-trim, *An*-ure (I.); *Ain* River, *Ain*-houe, *Aisne* River (F.).

AR, 'city.' *Ar*-gyle, *Ar*-isaig, *Ar*-nish, &c., 29 in all (S.); *Ar*-boe, *Ar*-magh, *Ar*-vagh, &c., 17 in all (I.); *Ar*-amitz, *Ar*-brois, *Ar*-tois, 53 in all (F.); the form *Ard*- occurs in 108 names (S. I. F.)

BAAL, the god of the Canaanites and idolatrous Israelites. *Bal*-carry, *Bal*-gair, *Bal*-naboth, &c., 86 in all (S.); *Bal*-carra, *Bal*-doyle, *Bal*-gatheran, &c., 106 in all (I.); *Bal*-a, *Bal*-combe, *Bal*'s-ham, &c., 10 in all (E. W.); *Bel*-haven, *Bel*-dornie, *Bel*-fast, &c., 36 in all (S. I. It is hardly necessary to mention that the forms in *Bel*-, referable to the French *beau*, *bel*, 'beautiful' have not been included); *Beal* Point, *Beal*-derrig, *Beal*' maha, &c., 11 times (S. I.) The Rev. Isaac Taylor, in *Words and Places*, adds *Bell* Hill, and Hill *Bell*; *Belan*, near Trefeglwys, in Montgomeryshire; *Belan*, near Newtown, two *Belan* Banks in Shropshire, the *Baal* Hills in Yorkshire; and *Bal*-erium, the ancient name of the Land's End.

BOZRA, 'citadel' or 'hill'; Phenician *Bursa*. *Birsa*, *Birse*, occur 6 times (S.).

CARMEL. *Carmel* Water (S.).

CHOR, 'hole.' *Chor*-achan, *Chor*-ick Glen (S.); *Choir* Loch, *Chuir*-na Loch, *Chur*-in (S.)

GAI, 'ravine.' *Gai*-r Loch, *Gai*-rnog Water, *Gai*-thorpe burn, &c., 16 in all (S.).

GAL, 'bubbling spring' or 'wave.' *Gal*-a Water, *Gal*-braith, *Gal*-vall, &c., 19 in all (S.).

HAR, 'mountain.' *Har*-burn, *Har*-den Castle, *Har*-nan Loch, &c., 9 times (S.); *Haer* Fuads (Roman Camp); *Hart*, 6 times (S.); *Har*-wood, *Har*-ter Fell (E.-W.); *Har*-court, *Har*-fleur, *Har*-one (F.)

IR, 'city.' *Ir-ane*, *Ir-vine*, *Ir-en*, &c., 6 times (S.); *Ir-by*, *Ir-chester*, *Ir-well*, &c., 7 times (E.-W.).

KIRIAH, 'fortress' or 'city,' seen by Dean Stanley in the Phœnician *Certa* (pronounced Kerta), *Car-thago*. *Caer* Laverock Castle (S.); *Caer-leon*, *Caer-marthen*, *Caer-narvon*, &c., 14 times in all (E.-W.); *Car-* occurs 106 times (S. I. E.-W. F.) as in *Car-lisle*, *Car-digan*; so *Caer-narvon* is often spelt *Car-narvon*.

KAL, a root meaning 'prison' or 'fortress.' *Cala*, *Cal-der*, *Cal-gary*, &c., 32 in all (S.); *Cal-hame*, *Cal-lan*, *Cal-tragh*, 8 in all (I.); *Kel* occurs 16 times (S.). Cf. *Cal-neh*, which is supposed to mean the "fortress of the god Ana."

MARA-ZION is a town in Cornwall; the name speaks for itself.

MAAN, 'springs.' *Main* River, *Maine* River, *Main-ham* (I.).

MAKOR, 'well-spring.' *Maghar-ee* Is.; *Magher-a*, *Magher-amore*, &c., 14 in all (I.).

MECHILLOTH, 'fissures.' *Macgilli-cuddy* Reeks, *Magilli-gan* Point (I.).

ROSH, 'head of a mountain.' *Rosh-k* Loch (S.); *Rosh-in* (I.); The *Ross-es* (I.); *Ross-* occurs 41 times (S. I. E.-W.); *Ros-* 18 times (S. I. E.-W. F.); *Rooss* (E.-W.); *Roos* (I.), *Les Rousses*, and *Rouss-illon* (F.) are probably to be referred to the same origin. *Ros* and *ross* also occur frequently elsewhere than at the beginning of names, as in *Muck-ross*, *Ard-ross-an*, &c.

SHEN, 'crag of a cliff.' *Shen-well* (S.); *Shan-* 14 times (S. I.); *Shean*, *Sheen* Water, *Sheen* River, *Shin-naah*, *Shin-rone* (S. I.).

TSUR, or TUR, 'rock.' Phœnician, *Tyre*. *Tor-* occurs 51 times (S. I. E.-W.); *Toor-* 4 times (I.).

Is there not in all this evidence from race, customs, and language, strong support to the proposition laid down at the beginning of this chapter as regards the so-called "Keltic" race? Does it not at once seem possible, to say the least, that, in accordance with the opinion mentioned above\*, the pre-Saxon inhabitants of the British Isles were partly Israelites and partly Canaanites?

And what if we also find points of close resemblance between these and the "Gothic" Saxons, whom we also believe to be Israelites? Let us listen to the words of Professor Sullivan, who has carefully studied the early history of the Irish. "The results which I have obtained . . . throw an unexpected light on the early institutions of the Anglo-Saxons, and upon the origin of the English representative system."† "In comparing the Irish political and social

\* pp. 14, 15.

† O'Curry, Vol. I., p. 11.



systems with those of adjacent countries, I have almost invariably referred to Anglo-Saxon England, and hardly ever to France, the head-quarters of the so-called Kelts."\* Again, "*All the fundamental principles of Anglo-Saxon law existed among the Britons and Irish.* The Saxons of Hengist and Horsa found on their arrival what we call Saxon laws and customs, and only effected territorial changes. This is precisely the conclusion to which a study of ancient Irish history, in the broad sense of that word, inevitably leads."† Finally, when we find that of the so-called "Kelts" a portion was *fair-haired* and *blue-eyed*, exactly like our "German" ancestors, the Saxons; and when Prof. Sullivan, writing with an entirely different object to that of the present essay, finds "a most special connection of their languages, the result either of long-continued unity or of a *very special relationship of the mind of the peoples*,"‡ the present supposition as to the origin of the Kelts seems not very far from the truth.

\* p. 17.

† Introduction, p. v.

‡ p. lxxvi.





### CHAPTER III.

#### DAN AND SIMEON IN THE ISLES OF THE WEST.

*The Tuatha de Dannan—Why did Dan remain in Ships?—Escape of Dan and Simeon from Palestine—The Milesians or Scots—Zedekiah's daughters, Jeremiah, and Baruch—The Princess from the East, the Prophet, and Simon Brug—David's Throne Perpetual—The Kymry or Belgæ—The Britons—Settlement of the Scots in Argyle—Early Missionary Ardour of the Scots in Ireland. B.C. 770 to A.D. 300.*

**A**MONGST the earliest colonists of Ireland, according to the traditions of the country, were those whose name has been handed down as the Tuatha de *Dan-nan*. From the same source it is ascertained that they came thither over the Mediterranean Sea, having been previously *connected both with Greece and Egypt*. Once grant that the traditions date from early Pagan times, and it is evident that the contention, at first sight so bold, that these were none other than a portion of the Tribe of Dan, becomes at once in harmony with facts already ascertained. The date of this first Israelitish immigration into the "Isles of the West" \* may have been during the early period of the naval enterprise of Dan, or it may have been the result of the first invasion of Israel by Assyria. If the latter, it would be about 770 B.C. *Why did Dan remain in ships?* May the reason not have been, that a portion of the Ten Tribes might escape the captivity, and make their way to the place which, in later times, was to give a home to their brethren who were carried captive? Moreover, the character of the Tuatha de *Dan-nan* can partly be discovered from these traditions; they were "a people remarkable for their knowledge of the domestic, if not the higher, arts of civilized life." † This must surely be significant; for accord-

\* Is. xxiv. 15. This remarkable phrase, used in Isaiah to denote the home of the Ten-Tribe nation, during their period of exile from the Holy Land, is misrendered in the A.V. "isles of the sea."

† O'Curry, -Vol. II., p. 3.

ing to all ordinary ethnological ideas, they should have been marked by the most rudimentary civilization.

The immigration succeeding that of the Dannan, at no long interval, is the Milesian colony of tradition, so called from their leader, but more generally known as *Scuit*, *Scoti*, or *Scots*. They were more numerous than the others, but of the same race, and with the same legendary antecedents. Prof. Sullivan says:—“As to the Milesians or Scots, the whole current of our legends and chronicles brings them from Spain.\* . . . The Tuatha de Danaan and the Milesians both belonged to the same race.”† Prof. O’Curry himself ‡ refers to “the peregrinations of the Milesians from *their departure from Egypt* to their arrival in Erin,” and to “*Eber*, one of the surviving leaders of the first Milesian colony.” The system of law, the existence of which among them from the earliest times, “is perfectly plain from all their traditions and records,” is proved to be the Hebrew law, alike by the points of resemblance shown before, and by the following striking tradition, which is recorded without the slightest comment. “It is stated in very old copies of the *Book of Invasions*, and other ancient documents, that *it was the Mosaic law that the Milesians brought into Erin at their coming*; that it had been learned and received from Moses in Egypt by Cae Cain Breathach, *who was himself an Israelite*, but had been sent into Egypt to learn the language of that country by the great master *Fenius Farsaidh*, from whom the Milesian brothers, who conquered Erin, are recorded to have been the twenty-second generation in descent; and it is stated in the preface to the *Seanchas Mor* that this was the law of Erin at the time of the coming of St. Patrick.” Here, then, may easily have been a second and larger immigration of Israelites into Ireland, who, during the period of Assyrian invasion, came by degrees across the Mediterranean *through Spain*, and then across the intervening part of the Atlantic. This may have contained the remainder of Dan; and not only that, but also Dan’s maritime neighbour, Simeon. The escape of Simeon with Dan is asserted by writers on the identity of the British with Israel, and we shall see further reason for admitting its probability.

I said above, “Once grant that the traditions date from early Pagan times” as an essential point towards establishing the possibility of these suppositions. I would ask the reader’s careful attention to the following striking evidence as to the value of these

\* O’Curry, Vol. I., lxxvi.

† Chap. lxxii.

‡ Vol. II., pp. 3, 4, 20, 24, 29, 51.

old traditions. Professor O'Curry's work on *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* has been already frequently quoted. The first volume consists of an introduction by Prof. W. K. Sullivan, and contains passages which I cannot forbear quoting here. He divides the sources of ancient Irish history into the testimony of the classical writers (which he states to be worthless), and the prose and poetic tales and legendary histories and relics of the laws of the Irish themselves.\* As regards the latter, he says † "There is internal evidence of antiquity in many of the tales. The heroic period of Irish history has left as indelible an impression upon the popular mind as that of Grecian history upon the Greeks . . . being preserved in the memory of the bards and transmitted orally from one to another from Pagan times. . . . One of the most characteristic features of Irish historical legends and poems is the definite localization of all the personages and incidents of the tales. It is possible to determine with great minuteness and accuracy the ancient topography of the country. We can follow the line of march of an army, or of an individual warrior or bard, with nearly as much certainty as we could in our day. . . . It is quite clear that if we found the old names used throughout a piece to the exclusion of the new ones, we should be justified in assuming that it was older than the change of names. In the recasting of tales and poems this topographical feature is in general well preserved—a circumstance which would seem to indicate that the tales were either simply abridged or amplified, the chief events and descriptions of the original being, when retained in the new piece, left unchanged." The reasons of this were that "no great displacements of people took place from about the second century to the twelfth; while the bardic institution existed in unbroken succession during the whole period, and the circumstances of the country which immediately succeeded the introduction of Christianity were more favourable to the transmission of old tales and poems than to the production of new ones." In the light of these remarks, how can the traditions previously referred to be explained, except on the supposition of the Israelitish origin of these early colonists of Ireland? I will therefore set forth in chronological order the facts recorded in the traditions, pointing out their supposed connection with Israel.

The period from 770 B.C. to 700 may be taken as that during which the various immigrations of Israelites took place—first a portion of the Tribe of Dan, which had not rested in its voyage until

\* p. 6

† pp. 11, 12.

safe in the harbours of North Ireland, succeeded by a series of colonies which passed through Spain, entering Ireland as *Scots*, i.e., *S'coth-ites*, "Wanderers among the Nations." Canaanitish immigrations had also taken place about the same time; and during the century from 700 to 600 the colonists of Ireland gradually formed settled governments. Four kingdoms took their rise—the later provinces of Ulster, Leinster, Munster, and Connaught; the last three comprising the settlements of the Canaanites, Ulster the Israelite kingdom of the Tuatha de Dannan, and the Milesian Scots.

Let us now turn our attention for a moment to Palestine, at the time of the captivity of Judah. The first captives had been removed to the dominions of the king of Babylon. The Jews still remaining in Judah were warned by Jeremiah not to flee into Egypt, but they discredited his prophecy of the destruction which awaited them there, and "Johanan the son of Kareah, and all the captains of the forces, took all the remnant of Judah, that were returned from all nations, whither they had been driven, to dwell in the land of Judah; even men, and women, and children, and *the king's daughters* . . . and *Jeremiah the prophet*, and *Baruch the son of Neriah*. *So they came into the land of Egypt.*"\* This is the last movement of Jeremiah recorded in the Sacred Writings—his being taken into Egypt accompanied by the *daughters of Zedekiah* and his scribe Baruch. There is no record of his return to Judah. Are we to suppose that he ended his days in Egypt? Not so, for he had received a commission from God, only half of which had been fulfilled. The commission was twofold: it was "to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and throw down;" but also, "*to build and to plant.*"† The first part was fulfilled in the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah; what of the second? In another passage of prophecy it is written: "Thus saith the Lord God; I will also take of the highest branch of the high cedar, and will set it; *I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent: in the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it:* and it shall bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar: and under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing; in the shadow of the branches thereof shall they dwell. And all the trees of the field shall know that I, Jehovah, have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and have made the dry tree to flourish: I, Jehovah, have spoken it, and have done it."‡ The simple explanation of this is

\* Jer. xliii. 5—7.

† Jer. i. 10.

‡ Ezek. xvii. 22—24.

that God, accomplishing His promised perpetuation of the sceptre of David, would take "a tender young twig" (*i.e.*, a daughter) "of the highest branch of the high cedar" (*i.e.*, the latest reigning representative of the House of David), and remove it to a "mountain sprung from the elevation of Israel" (*i.e.*, an Israelitish kingdom sprung from the kingdom of Israel, "a part of the nation, which God had lifted up as an independent people"):<sup>\*</sup> in short, God designed to perpetuate the kingship of the House of David by transferring a member of the family of Zedekiah to a kingdom formed by escaped Israelites, there to originate a line of kings, which should continue until He, whose right it is, shall come in glorious majesty to reign. *What, then, but this, was Jeremiah's commission to build and to plant?*

To return to the traditions: it is recorded that at a point, during the rise of the four Irish kingdoms, there arrived in Ireland a *princess from the East*, in the charge of a *prophet*, who was accompanied by one Simon Brug. They had journeyed from some Eastern country *through Spain*. About this time Eochaidh, king of Ulster—*i.e.*, according to the previous supposition, of the Israelitish settlement in North Ireland—was elected Heremon, or high king of all Ireland. It was to this monarch's court that the visitors went. The sequel was, that Eochaidh married the Eastern princess, by name Tea Tephi (the latter having a signification in Hebrew, but none in Irish); *abandoned Baalism*, changed the name of his capital to *Tara*, an almost exact Hebrew word, meaning "The Law of the Two Tables;" and founded a *Mur Ollamhan*, or "School of the Prophets." Has not all this a striking significance? *The king's daughters, Jeremiah the prophet, Baruch—an Eastern princess, a prophet, Simon Brug—* does not this triple coincidence fairly point to only one conclusion? When, besides this, we think of Jeremiah's disappearance with his commission unfulfilled, of the independent grounds for believing that there was a colony from Israel in the North of Ireland, and of the events recorded as immediately following the arrival of the mysterious visitors, can we fail to see that Simon Brug and Baruch are the same, that the prophet is Jeremiah, and that Tea Tephi is one of the daughters of Zedekiah, and so a branch of the House of David. One thing is certain, that the line of sovereigns descended from Eochaidh and Tephi has continued to the present day.† In this way God's promise to perpetuate the sceptre of David's family would be fulfilled. Many will probably ask, But was not that promise ful-

\* This is plainly worked out in Mr. Marriott's *Hora Prophetica*, chap. xv.

† *i.e.* through the early Scots kings to the present royal House of Britain.

filled in the first coming of Christ to commence His spiritual kingdom? For such I submit the following passages, which I would ask them to consider thoughtfully. Listen to the words of Jeremiah : "Thus saith the Lord, *David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel. . . . If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night . . . then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne.*"\* Again :—"Thus saith the Lord, *If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, then will I cast away the seed of Jacob and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*"† Between Zedekiah and Christ was an interval of 580 years. Where was the fulfilment of this prophecy during all that time, if the Davidic succession over Israel did not go on consecutively from Zedekiah? To this question, involving as it does matters of the greatest interest, it has been impossible to do full justice here. For a full account I refer the reader to the Rev. F. R. A. Glover's remarkable work entitled "England, the Remnant of Judah and Israel of Ephraim," which embodies the final result of the long and valuable labours of the man who first set forth to the world the manner of the perpetuation of David's seed.

The date of the momentous event which I have just detailed would be about 580. For 210 years the descendants of Eochaidh and Tea Tephri reigned at Tara in uninterrupted peace. The Scots, in whose name that of Tuatha de Dannan was soon merged, probably confined their settlements to the north of Ireland for several centuries. Some of their tribe-names point to the presence among them of Simeonites—such are *Sem-righe*, *Tuath Semonn*, *Sen-mogad*, *Sen-eran*. In Connaught, as in Britain later, we find the name *Dam-non-ii*, similarly pointing to Dan. To these may be added the *Darn-ii* of North Ireland, the *Damn-ii* of Argyle, the *Dem-etæ* of Cambria, and the *Simen-i* in the Eastern Counties of England. As time went on the Scots made predatory excursions from Ireland to the coast of Britain; and after the non-Scotic tribes had been successfully reduced, and amalgamated with the dominant ones, these assumed the more steady purpose of permanent conquest. This was about the commencement of the Christian era, at which time their dominion extended over Wales and Cornwall. Early in the Roman period we hear of the Isle of Man as "inhabited by people of the Scots;" and in the third century A.D. the Irish Scots had

\* xxxiii. 17-21.

† 25, 26.

effected a permanent conquest in the south-west of Scotland—corresponding to the modern Argyle—and the adjoining islands called *Hebrides*, and the lowland counties except the district of *Galloway*, which was a settlement of the Picts. The whole Highland district and the neighbouring coast was occupied by the *Canaanitish Picts or Gael*.\*

At this point the question will probably occur, Who were the "Britons"? In answer to this, I would refer the reader to the fact that the descendants of those Britons are known at the present day as Kymry; also to the preceding chapter, where the division of the "Kelts" into Kelts proper, and Kymry or Belgae, was pointed out as a fact agreed upon by historical authorities. Of these we saw reason for believing the former to be mainly Canaanites, the latter to be Israelites of the Tribes of Dan and Simeon. Some of these Israelites were traced through Spain into Ireland; others must have remained behind in Spain, and at some period after B.C. 700, pushing northwards and ever increasing in numbers and power as time went on, concentrated in the district between the rivers Seine and Rhine, corresponding to the modern northern provinces of France, with Belgium and Holland. That was the country where the name of Belgae survived into later times, and where the customs which had distinguished them from the "Gauls," having taken root from the length of their sojourn, were still practised even after they may have left. It was from this country that the greater part of the early colonists of South Britain undoubtedly came. When the first of them crossed the narrow separating sea may remain for ever uncertain. It seems probable that there were some still in the north of France, shortly before 100 B.C. It is also probable that no Kymric bands entered Britain after Cæsar's invasion of this island in the middle of the first century B.C., but as a century elapsed before the next occasion of contact with Rome, it is quite possible that the immigrations of the Kymric Belgae continued even after the commencement of the Christian era. However that may be, about 250 A.D. the escaped remnant of Israel held the whole of south Britain, and the lower half of north Britain, and still retained the northern districts of Ireland. South Ireland and north-west Scotland harboured those Canaanites who were destined to be sad thorns in the side of the

\* It might be supposed that the ancestors of the present Highlanders were of "German" origin, as Tacitus in his *Agricola* alludes to their "German" features; but we have seen above (p. 23) that amongst the "Kelts" there were some with fair hair and blue eyes, and if these were the Scoti, the explanation is simple, as the expedition of *Agricola* penetrated inland to the E. side of Argyle, but no further.



rising nation of Israel. Among these at a later period the errors of Rome took the greatest hold. From these in our own days have come the insurrections of the *Fenians* (Phœnians, Phœnicians) and the agitation for Home Rule. May the time be not far distant when they will cease to vex.

Very early the light of the Gospel shone on Israel in Britain. The Roman dominion, at no time settled, could not prevent its spread. No sooner had the Scots in Ireland received it, than they were seized with an enthusiasm for spreading the good news far and wide. Their evangelists were known through every part of Western Europe. At one place in Switzerland, a cathedral dedicated to St. Lucius, who was none other than Leaur Mawr, "The Great Light," the first Christian king of Britain, testifies most strikingly that this was true. Such was the beginning of that long series of missionary enterprise, which now carries from ransomed Israel, renewing its strength in the "Isles of the West," the glad tidings of great joy to every corner of that great globe which must all one day own the "righteous nation's" sway, to bring it to the feet of Christ. "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."





## CHAPTER IV.

### KYMRIC ISRAEL AMONG THE GENTILES.

*Micah's Prophecy—First Historical Movements of the Kelts—The Kymry advance on Rome—Battle of the Allia—The Kymry enter Galatia, and gradually become a terror to the neighbouring States—The Galatians converted to Christianity—Taken as prisoners to the North West Shore of the Black Sea. B.C. 700 to A.D. 267.*

**I**F it be true that the Kymric division of the so-called Kelts were Israelites, then all the history which can be recovered of those Kymry is part of the history of exiled Israel; and we seem not to have done with the "Remnant that escaped" the captivity, when we have traced the greater portion into the British Isles. In Micah there is a prediction which reads as follows:—"And the remnant of Jacob shall be *among the Gentiles* in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep, who, *if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver.*"\* This is a prophecy *not limited* to any special time, but applying to the whole period of the wanderings of exiled Israel, and belonging equally to the tribes of the Captivity and to the section which escaped.

It must be borne in mind that there was ample time for everything which has been described. The supposition has been that there were numerous colonies made by Canaanites in Spain during the greater part of the 8th century B.C., and that towards the close of that century they commenced a gradual occupation of Gaul; while it was not until the close of the 5th century that the first certain historical appearance of the "Kelts" took place. It is probable that there was a continuous series of migrations from the east to the west of the Alps, extending over a period of many years, consisting of parts of both divisions of the "Keltic" races, the Gauls and the Kymry—the Canaanites and the Israelites. That this is no arbitrary assumption

tion may be seen from the following quotation from Dr. Arnold's *History of Rome*\*:—"If we are disposed to rely on the statement of Diodorus and Appian, that the Gauls who invaded Greece were Kimbri, it may be very possible that there was a more general movement among the Keltic tribes in the fourth century of Rome, than the Greek or Roman writers were aware of. The Kymry, breaking in upon the Gael, may have persuaded or forced some of their tribes to join them in their march southwards; *the two nations* may have poured into Italy together, and while the Gaelic tribes settled themselves on the Po, or on the coast of the Adriatic, the mass of the Kymrians may have pressed forward round the head of the gulf, and so penetrated into Pannonia and Thrace. Nor could we deny the possibility of some Kymrians having remained in Italy with the Gael; and if we believe that the name of *Brennus* was really borne by the leader of the attack on Rome, and that this word is no other than the Kymrian '*Brenhin*,' which signifies king or leader, *then we must conclude that although the mass of the invaders were Gael, yet not only were Kymrians joined with them, but that a Kymrian chief commanded the whole expedition.*" Dr. Arnold, however, did not regard the evidence he was able to collect as conclusive; but our evidence is stronger, by the number of *undesigned coincidences* pointing to the presence of Israelites among these "Gauls."

It was probably in the year 400 B.C. that the last Keltic band crossed the Alps. These were Kymrians, whose superiority to the Gael was immediately shown. Their name *Senones* (Cf. *Simeni*, *Semonn*, *Senmogad*, and other similar forms quoted in the previous chapter) not improbably is a Latin representation of *Simeon*, and survived among the Gael as a reminiscence of the Kymrian supremacy. In the plains of the Po they exterminated the Etruscans, and in the year 390 B.C. crossed the Apennines, and penetrated into central Italy.

*They advance on Rome. This was the first contact of the "remnant of Jacob" with the fourth great World-Empire, as yet in its early infancy. In one great battle Rome was for a moment trodden down and torn in pieces, and there was none to deliver. This is known in history as the Battle of the Allia. The engagement itself is well described by Dr. Arnold, in the following words:—"The Gaulish leader showed more than a barbarian's ability. With the bravest of his warriors he assailed the right of the Roman position: the soldiers of the poorer classes (in the Roman army), unused to war, and*

untrained in the management of their arms, were appalled by the yells, and *borne down by the strength of their enemies*; and their wooden shields were but a poor defence against the fearful strokes of the Keltic broadsword. The right of the Roman army was broken and chased from its ground; the fugitives in their flight disordered the ranks of the regular legions; and, the Gauls pursuing their advantage, *the whole Roman army was totally routed*. The Gauls slaughtered them in heaps on the banks of the Tiber, and overwhelmed them with their javelins in the river, *so that a large part of the flower of the Roman people was here destroyed*." After the lapse of one day, Brennus entered Rome, and *destroyed the city by fire*. He then devastated Southern Italy, and eventually returned to the Keltic settlement north of the Apennines. The Romans in later ages talked of a deliverer, Camillus, who is almost universally discredited by modern historians. The truth was that God did not mean Rome to remain in the hands of Israel. The Fourth World-Empire had yet to arise, and perform its appointed work. But "in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed . . . it shall break in pieces *all these kingdoms*, and it shall stand for ever."\*

The Kymric "Gauls" seem to have, again and again, during the century succeeding their first appearance, carried the terror of their arms from one end of Italy to the other. The Gael proper remained in the valley of the Po, and were finally subjected by the Romans, so that here, as in Gaul and Spain, Canaan was the servant of Japhet. -


The year 279 B.C. witnessed the next great move of Kymric Israel. Leaving the north of Italy, they overran the country corresponding in modern times to Bosnia, Servia, and European Turkey. *Entering Macedonia, they defeated and slew Ptolemy Ceraunus, the successor of Alexander the Great*. In the following year, they turned their arms southwards, and received a sudden check at Delphi, in Greece. A look at the map will show that this was a digression from their right course, and they were thus forcibly pulled back. Collecting all their forces, they left Europe, and crossed the Hellespont into Asia. From 278 B.C. to 267 A.D. they occupied a district in the heart of Asia Minor, which received the name of *Galatia*. *In 261 B.C. they defeated and slew Antiochus I., the representative in Syria of the former empire of Alexander*. They gradually became a terror

\* Dan. ii. 44.

*throughout Asia.\* These Israelites formed a great part of the early converts to Christianity, remaining in the same district until A.D. 267, when, in company with other Christians, they were carried as prisoners to the country on the North-west of the Black Sea. Their history, subsequent to that event, will be considered in a later chapter.*

\* Chronological Tables of Ancient History.







PART II.





THE TRIBES OF THE CAPTIVITY.











## CHAPTER V.

### THE SCENE OF THE CAPTIVITY.

*The Captivities of Israel—"Habor, which is Cabul"—Harran, Gauzanitis, and the Khabour—The Boundaries of Assyria—The Chebar—The River Gozan—Hara, Habor, and Halah—The Cities of the Medes. B.C. 740 to 714.*

**T**HE places where Ephraim-Israel last appears on the page of history have never hitherto been identified with any degree of certainty, although several ideas have been advanced, some of them differing so widely, that it becomes imperative to settle the question, as the one consideration likely to furnish the best clue to the line or lines followed by Israel in their migration.

There were two distinct deportations, with an interval of twenty years between, but both to the same localities. On the first occasion, in 740 B.C., Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, took "Ijon, and Abel-beth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Napthali, and carried them captive to Assyria;"\* also "the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the River Gozan unto this day."† This captivity was complete as regards Northern and Eastern Israel. The second, complete as regards the remainder, came in 721, when Shalmaneser (or Sargon) "took Samaria, and carried Israel away captive into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor, (by) the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."‡

Of the divergent theories, one flies to the extreme East, another to the extreme West; the former identifies at any rate Habor with part of Afghanistan—"Habor, which is Cabul." But the Assyrian monarchs, so far from being able to extend their empire to such a

\* 2 Kings xiv. 29.

† 1 Chron. v. 26.

‡ 2 Kings xvii. 6; xviii. 2.

distance, had trouble enough in controlling their nearest subjects, the Medes, who struggled against their yoke till they were finally (B.C. 711) successful. The only reason for mentioning this view is to warn people against it, as it has no claim to be seriously entertained for a moment.

For the rival Western theory, however, a very plausible case has been made out; but before considering it, it will be well to give the different forms assumed by the names of the places under discussion. Habor occurs in the Greek versions as  $\text{'Αβωρ}$  (Abor) or  $\text{Χαβωρ}$  (Chabor); Halah as  $\text{'Αλαε}$  or  $\text{Χαλαχ}$  (Ala-e, Chalach); and Hara in a Latin version as Ara, being omitted in the LXX.; the initial guttural of each being of such a nature that it can be represented in Greek by a soft breathing, that is to say, practically no sound at all. This view then identifies—

*Hara* with *Haran* or *Carrhæ* (Mesopotamia);

*Habor* with the river (!) *Chaboras*, *Aborrhæ*, modern *Khabour*;

*Gozan* being the neighbouring district (!), and represented by the later *Gauzanitis* (*Ptolemy*, Geog. v. 18), or *Mygdonia* (*Strabo*, *Polybius*, &c.), a name supposed to be simply *M'gozan*;

and *Halah* being found in the *Chalcitis* of *Ptolemy*, now represented by a mound on the Khabour, with the name of *Gla* (*Mejdel* also occurs in the same spot).

Such a series of names looks very formidable at first sight, but a closer inspection reveals several fatal errors. In the first place, Habor is forced to mean a river, and Gozan forced to mean a district, simply because the account in Kings reads "*in Habor, the river of Gozan*," where the A.V. has very reasonably supplied "by." This rendering either places the unhappy Israelites actually *in* the river (!), or makes Halah and the cities of the Medes also rivers (!), for the passage reads "*in Halah—in Habor—in the cities*," where it is surely arbitrary to say that one of these evidently parallel expressions means *on* a river, the others *in* a city. Besides, the plain statement in Chronicles shows this to be impossible ("*unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan*," where Habor does not even come next to the river Gozan); impossible, that is to say, unless the canonicity of that book is to be given up; this, however, the writer of the article "*Gozan*," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, seems not to have much scruple in doing. "*Gozan seems* in the A. V. of 1 Chron. v. 26 to be the name of a *river*; but in Kings it is

evidently applied not to a river but to a country. Where Kings and Chronicles differ, the authority of the latter is weak; and the name Gozan will therefore be taken in the present article for the name of a tract of country." . . . "Mr. Layard describes this region (the tract watered by the Khabour) as one of remarkable fertility." (This very fact is cited by Dean Stanley in "Sinai and Palestine," where he refers it to the *Chebar*, a much more likely candidate). "According to the LXX., Halah and Habor were both rivers of Gozan, but this is a mistranslation of the Hebrew text. . . . *The conjunction of Gozan with Harran in Isaiah (xxxvii. 12) is in entire agreement with the position here assigned to the former. As Gozan was the district on the Khabour, so Haran was that on the Bilik, the next affluent of the Euphrates. The Assyrian kings, having conquered the one, would go on to conquer the other.*" Granted, as to the last statement; but it seems probable that the *Western boundary of Assyria*, at the time of the first captivity, *was the Khabour itself*. How, then, should the Assyrian King have placed his captives in territory, at the best but recently subdued, *especially when that territory was the most convenient possible for their return at the first opportunity to their own land?* He was too wise for that. As to the "conjunction of Gozan with Harran," the passage itself shews the futility of any argument being drawn therefrom. "Have the gods of the nations," boasts the King of Assyria, "delivered them which my fathers have destroyed, Gozan and Haran, and Rezep, and the children of Eden which were in Telassar? Where is the King of Hamath, and the King Arphad, and the King of the city of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah?" Was a monarch recounting, in a moment of pride, the nations he had subdued, likely to think of geographical order? Or, if Napoleon had said, "Where are the Kings of Spain, of Germany, of Portugal, and Austria?" would it be an obvious inference from the "conjunction" of Portugal and Austria that they were geographically contiguous? At the same time, there is no necessity to connect this Gozan, which is a country, with the other Gozan, the river. A small point is that Haran, a familiar place in early Bible narrative, and having a recognised form, would hardly appear as Hara. Haran it was, and Harran it is to this day. A last consideration, before dismissing this view, is that a much more reasonable identification of the Khabour is ready at hand in Ezekiel's river Chebar, the place whither the first small band of captives from Judah were taken. This tract, never properly subdued by Assyria, on the disruption of that

empire fell to the share of Babylonia, a quarter of a century before the first captivity of Judah; and, as being the most remote part of his dominions from Judah, the King of Babylon would naturally choose it for the Jewish captives. The presence of the name Mejdél ("Watchtower," Hebrew) would then be equally well explained, and the name Mygdonia is much more reasonably referred to that, through the form Mygdol, than to the marvellous form M'gozan, which reminds one forcibly of the names of Central Africa. Thus it may safely be said that this view need only be resorted to as a last resource.

The identifications set forth below have grown up step by step from small beginnings, each additional discovery seeming to increase the certainty; and it is now submitted for the careful consideration of all interested in knowing the truth of this question. The first general idea was that the scene of the captivity was the district to the south-west of the Caspian Sea. After a study of the account in the Bible, and a glance at an ancient atlas, this resolved itself into the belief that *all the places mentioned were in Media*—certain places being specially selected; and the rest, where comparatively small portions of the captives were placed, being described generally as "the Cities of the Medes"; just as we might say, "London, Liverpool, and the towns of England," "Paris, Marseilles, and the cities of France." *Media, in its fullest extent, had only one river* seriously deserving the name, of considerable length, fairly central situation, with many tributaries, and reaching the sea, the other streams disappearing in the sand after a much shorter course. This river naturally struck the eye at once, and the immediate inference was, *this must be the river Gozan*. A good modern atlas (*Stieler's Hand-Atlas*) next revealed two towns at a little distance respectively from the right and left bank of this river, named *Abhar* and *Huru*, which seemed at once to correspond to *Habor* and *Hara*, a conclusion since confirmed by the discovery that the LXX. for the former gives *Abor*. It was not at once that the name of the river itself was seen to throw any light on the question. Where it comes out into the Caspian the name is *Sefid Rud* (White River), but for three quarters of its course it is *Kizil* (River) *Ousan* or *Ozen*, a fact sufficiently striking in itself, and made more so by the discovery that in Spruner's *Historical Atlas*—in a map illustrating the history of the Caliphate, or the period about 1000 A.D.—the name is quite casually, with no sign of allusion to the river of Captivity, given as *Gozen*, *Uzen*. Thus the almost certain discovery was arrived at that *the one River of ancient*

*Media has kept its name down to the present day, and is the River Gozan.*

The different steps by which this was arrived at may seem to some to have been set forth at needless length; but it was rendered necessary by the strong support which the Western hypothesis receives. It will be interesting to know that the great Hebrew authority, Ewald, states the identity of the ancient and modern names of the river of Media without the least expression of doubt. "The River Gozan, *still known by the name of Ozen*, flowed past the site in ancient times of a city name Gauzania. The city, however, of this name referred to in 2 Kings xix. 12, must be looked for, on account of the other cities mentioned in conjunction with it, in Mesopotamia."\* The identification of Halah with Calah on the Tigris, and Habor with a second Khabour falling into that river, while not unreasonable, is still open to some of the objections mentioned before.

The strong position which had been arrived at was not at all affected by the failure so far to identify Halah; the wonder, indeed, was that any of the names survived. However a reference to the large-scaled and exquisitely-minute Map of modern Persia in Keith Johnstone's truly Royal Atlas, shewed on a tributary of the Kizil Ouzan the town of *Ala-mut*, the first part of which may well correspond to *Halah*, especially as the LXX. write *Ala-e*. Many other names given in this map form strong cumulative proof of the correctness of this position, as may be seen from the following summary.

This view identifies the River *Gozan* with the *Gozen* of the 10th Century and the *Ouzan* of to-day.

<i>Hara</i> is found in <i>Haru</i> ,	} towns in the immediate neighbourhood of this river.
<i>Habor</i> ( <i>Abor</i> ) in <i>Abhar</i> ,	
<i>Halah</i> ( <i>Ala-e</i> ) possibly in <i>Ala-mut</i> ,	

The other *Cities of the Medes* may be traced in the following list of names of possible Hebrew origin:—

<i>Sakkis</i> marks the W. limit	} of the captivity of the House of
<i>Sakis</i> -abad, the E. limit	
	I-saak.
<i>Sain-kala</i> } root <i>Kal</i> , "fortress," seen in Cal(a)neh, "the fort of	Ana."
<i>Kele-kora</i> }	
<i>Dezi</i> (a tributary of Kizil Ouzan)	... <i>Daci</i> , "waves."
<i>Shah</i> " " "	... <i>Shaveh</i> , "vale."

\* *History of Israel*, Book iv., p. 165.


<i>Mt. Esel-ik</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Eshel</i> , "tamarisk."
<i>Massula</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Matsoolah</i> , "bottom."
<i>Mazra</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Matsoorah</i> , "fort."
<i>Mahun</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Mahon</i> , "den."
<i>Miana</i>	...	...	...	}	<i>M'an</i> , "springs."
<i>Men-jil</i>	...	...	...		
<i>Ar-dabil</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Ar</i> , "city."
<i>Safa-ris</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Saphah</i> , "river-brink."
<i>Kiare</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Kiriah</i> , "city."
<i>Souk Baluk</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Shuk</i> , "street."
<i>Mish-kin</i>	...	...	...	...	<i>Mish-or</i> , "downs."
<i>Dan-ishban</i>					
<i>Suleiman-ia.</i>					
<i>Takhti Suleiman.</i>					

The latter is said to be probably the site of the old capital of Media, of which one name was *Gauza-ca*, just as a neighbouring ridge of mountains was *Mons Jason-ius*—names plainly pointing to the old name of the river. It is also noticeable that Tobit was with the captives at *Rhages*, a city of Media, and not, therefore, of Western Assyria. Further, *Kir* (represented in the modern river *Kur*), the scene of the captivity of Syria, was in the northern part of the same region. The list of Hebrew words, as applied to local names, is taken from Dean Stanley's "Sinai and Palestine." A person actually acquainted with Hebrew would very probably see more names of similar origin. Of the modern names, some will still show where the captive Israelites actually settled; others simply embody traditions of their presence. Such a supposition involves no improbability; the *two large rivers and mountain chain intervening* would admit of the captives being allowed to settle in communities, while there is nothing impossible in the long survival of the names. It would be the natural result, if, as some think, the King of Assyria employed the Israelites in Media to keep the Medes in subjection. Indeed it may well be that these names of little-known rivers and towns remain to the present day to serve as emphatic witnesses to the truth of those sacred narratives, which it is too often the fashion to pass over in silent contempt.











## CHAPTER VI.

### THE ESCAPE OF ISRAEL INTO EUROPE.

*Ammi, and Lo-ammi—Beth Khumri, Beth I-saac, and S'koth-ites—  
I-tsahak or Tsahak—Two independent witnesses—The narrow  
passages of the Euphrates—Ar-sareth—The Sereth—Revolt of the  
Medes—The Scüths cross the Araxes, and reach the "Kimmerian  
Land"—The Kimmerians. B.C. 714 to 654.*

“**HOW** shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within Me, My repentings are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim, for I am God, and not man.”\* Such was God’s merciful assurance, delivered through the mouth of Hosea, at the very time when He was allowing His ungrateful children to be removed into captivity. How then could their future be to continue in captivity and eventually become absorbed in alien races?

Before attempting, however, to trace their fortunes, it will be well to consider the various names under which we may reasonably look for the Israelites at different periods of their exiled state. With their removal from the land, they ceased to share directly in the covenant with God. They had been to Him *AMMI*, that is, “My people;” there was a time promised in the future when they should be *Ammi* again; but now they were *Lo-ammi*: “for ye are not My people, and I will not be your God.”† Now Israel was their covenant name, therefore *Israel is not the name under which we are to expect to find them*. What other possible names then were there? First, that of *Beth Khumri*, “the House of Omri,” the name applied by the Assyrian inscriptions to the kingdom of Israel. Secondly, *Beth I-saac*, a name used as a synonym for Jacob or Israel in the following passages: “And the high places of Isaac shall be desolate,

\* Hos. xi, 8, 9.

† i. 9.

and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste ; and I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword." "Thou sayest, Prophecy not against Israel, and drop not thy word against the house of Isaac."\* As to the form of this name, the Hebrew for "laughter" is *tsahak*, of which *I-tsahak* is only a strengthened form ; this fact must be borne in mind. In addition to these names, "The House of *Joseph*" is frequently used. *S'coth*-ites, dwellers in *S'coth* or Tents, we have already seen to be an appropriate name for "Wanderers among the Nations ;" and lastly, Ephraim was called *Engel*, an "heifer." The first, second, and fourth names are those which I would ask the reader to keep most prominently before him.

Having noted thus much as to the names under which outcast Israel might be found, we are in a position to consider the *manner* and the *time* of Israel's escape. The *fact* of Israel's escape is indisputable. It is only necessary to read the expressions of Jehovah's merciful intentions in such passages as that from Hosea which opens the present chapter, to see that the fact could not have been otherwise. It was involved in the *nature of the case*.

What evidence is there, then, as to the *how* and the *when* of the escape of Israel from the land of their captivity?

The answer to this question is close at hand. Remarkable as it may seem, it is nevertheless the fact, that the *precise* manner in which that escape was effected is made clear from the testimony of *two independent witnesses*. The approximate *date* may be similarly arrived at.

The first half of my evidence is found in one of the books of the Apocrypha, which claims for its author Ezra, the contemporary of Nehemiah. Although this claim is almost universally disallowed, I have strong reasons for believing that the "Second Book of Esdras" is rightly ascribed to Ezra ; and, therefore, that it should have a place in the canon of the Old Testament. If this be the case, the historical facts narrated in it are, of course, as authentic as those recorded in the other books of the Scripture ; on the other hand, if the book be a late composition, and falsely ascribed to Ezra, the facts narrated in it must still be impartially weighed, even if they are only to be regarded as traditions. Now there is one such fact, or it may be tradition, to which, as bearing on the question under consideration, I desire to turn the reader's attention. The passage which I am going to quote is in the highest degree striking. Listen then

\* Amos vii. 9, 16.

to the words of Ezra :—"Those are the Ten Tribes which were carried away prisoners out of their own land in the time of Osea the King, whom Shalmanasar, the King of Assyria, led away captive, and he carried them over the waters, and so came they into another land. But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. And *they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river.* For the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood till they were passed over. For through that country there was *a great way to go*, namely, of a year and a half. And the same region is called *Arsareth.* *Then dwelt they there until the latter time.*" \*

Here, then, is a distinct assertion of the escape of the Israelites from that "other country," whither the King of Assyria had carried them, and which we have seen to be the country of the Medes. They are here represented as crossing the Euphrates "by the narrow passages," that is, at some point in its upper sources. They then journey through a tract of country requiring a year and a half to traverse, if they travel all the time, making no long halts on the way. At the further end of this journey they come to a region named Ar-sareth, and this region they are destined to occupy "until the latter time," that is, until the age of the Messiah.†

It was more than a year before the time of the final revision of this portion of my essay, that I first read the foregoing remarkable passage. Indeed, it was this very passage which led me to see what I am now endeavouring to show to others. No sooner had I read it, and grasped firmly in my mind the name Ar-sareth, than the solution which I now present for the reader's consideration came like a flash of light. But it could hardly have come so readily had I not, by previous education, become well grounded in what may be termed the "facts of geography," the prominent geographical features of the different countries of the earth. This is the solution. Fifteen hundred miles in a straight line from the ancient capital of Media brings us to the north of Moldavia. Here is still the river *Sereth*, with a town of the same name, almost at its source. Might not this be the Ar-sareth of Esdras? This supposition was subsequently confirmed by finding

\* 2 Esdras xiii. 40—46.

† Christ's first Advent was the beginning of "the latter days" (*vide* Heb. i. 2), which, it must be observed, are to be distinguished from the "last time" or "time of the end."

that another writer had arrived at the same conclusion, in the following words :—"If we draw a straight line in a north-westerly direction from Media, through Armenia, to the boundary of the world, as known to the Romans, we shall find it passes through the Crimea to the northern portion of the Danubian provinces. In that country there remains to this day a place named Ar-sareth, *i.e.*, 'the city, or hill, of Sereth.' The river Sereth flows beside the city of the same name."\* A search in Stieler's Hand Atlas, along the most natural route to follow for an advance in this direction, revealed the striking names of *Gumri*, Mt. *Kumry*, and *Deli Musa*. Continued searching in other atlases and old maps, several on a large scale, preserved by me since the time of the last Russo-Turkish War, gradually brought to light a number of names, on or near the same natural route, and forming, as it seemed to me, strong corroborating evidence. These names are of possible Hebrew origin. They occur at intervals along the route, which was, as I have said, the most natural one. They are found on the confines of Media and Armenia; in Armenia itself, in great numbers along the line of advance and retreat in the last Russo-Turkish War; on the borders of the Black Sea; in the Crimea; and in South Russia, up to the very source of the River Sereth. As however many of these names may owe their origin to some form of Shemitic speech other than Hebrew, I will not append them here, although I am strongly inclined to see in them living memorials of the great Israelitish migration into Europe.

Before proceeding to compare, with the striking evidence already adduced, the testimony of my second independent witness, I wish to call attention to some circumstances, which were favourable to the escape of Israelites. At some date subsequent to the last deportation of Israel into Media, in all probability shortly before the close of the eighth century B.C., the Medes revolted from the Assyrians, and gained an independence, which they kept till their subjection by Cyrus. Until the Medes were established in their kingdom, so Herodotus informs us,† they had no settled government, living in villages, not in fortified towns. "So great was the lawlessness throughout the whole of Media" that, when one man was known to practise justice, he was elected their first king. At one time, when he, for his own objects, before his election, ceased to dispense justice, "plundering and lawlessness was carried on to a much greater extent than before throughout

\* The Rev. B. W. Savile, in *Are we Israelites* ? p. 26.

† I. 96. 7.

their villages." Then it was that the Medes besought their former judge to be their king. "Come," said they, "let us set a king over us. For so shall our country be well governed, and we ourselves be turned to our works, nor shall we be disturbed by a state of lawlessness." Such was the people among whom the captive Israelites had been placed, as some think in order to keep the Medes in subjection to Assyria; and it cannot be considered an improbable supposition that, during the confusion resulting on the Median revolution, the Israelites effected their escape.

But there is another equally probable supposition. The Assyrian king may have placed his captives on the further side of the mountains of Media, to prevent their return to their own land, and for no other reason. This is what I am myself inclined to believe. In this case the Medes and the Israelites would have had a common foe, and, therefore, so long as there was any need, the Israelites would be likely to support the Medes. It is not, however, probable that they would have remained scattered in detachments throughout Media, especially considering the anarchy resulting in that country on the first success against Assyria. On the contrary, they would most naturally collect together, and occupy territory adjoining Media, so as to be at hand to give assistance to their allies. Now, to the south of Media other nations dwelt, the Babylonians, namely, and the Elamites; and the Israelites could not have occupied country on that side. To settle on the east of Media would have been useless, the object being what is assumed. To the west lay Assyria. There remains the country to the north of Media; and, from a careful inspection of the maps, in both ancient and modern atlases, of the region bordering on the south-western shores of the Caspian Sea, I arrive at the following conclusion as to the more satisfactory account of the movements of the Israelites, immediately after the revolt of the Medes from Assyria. *Until the Assyrian power was so completely crushed, as to cease to be a source of danger to the Medes, the Israelites occupied the strip of country intervening between the northern mountain range of Media and the Armenian river called Araxes.*

I will now proceed to fix the main dates which mark this period. According to the statements of Herodotus, the first successful revolution of the Medes, from which they dated the commencement of their ascendancy, took place (contingently on the correctness of the date B.C. 530, generally received as that of the death of Cyrus) in the year B.C. 714. Now Deïokes, the first King of Media, began to reign in 708. Hence B.C. 714—708 would be the period of anarchy

during which the Israelites settled in a body in the tract of country south of the river Araxes. After a reign of fifty-three years, Deïokes was succeeded by his son Phraortes, in the year 655. During the whole of the reign of the first Median king, the Assyrians made repeated attempts to regain their supremacy over the Medes. This is evident from the Assyrian inscriptions, which constantly refer to expeditions against Diakku and his Medes. But, with the end of the reign of Deïokes, the Assyrian attempts ceased. No sooner had Phraortes—the Arphaxad of the Apocrypha—ascended the throne, than the complete independence of the Medes was established. In the year 655, the power of the old Assyrian Empire of Nineveh was finally cast off. And it is this year 655 which I take to be the date of the departure of the Ten Tribes from Media, their passage of the Euphrates, and their progress towards the country of Arsareth.

At length the way is clear for my second independent witness to give his evidence. He is none other than the Greek historian and geographer, *Herodotus*—himself possibly of the stock of Dan,\* and so a scion of the elect generations. This remarkable searcher after facts has given a very prominent place in his great work to a nation known as *Scûths*, to whom he constantly appends in a most striking manner the name of *Nomads*—the Wanderers, *par excellence*. The name *Scûth* itself (so generally spelt *Scyth*, and mispronounced †) we have before seen to be, in all probability, formed from the Hebrew word meaning “booths” or “tents,” and applied secondarily to *Wanderers* of the Hebrew race. The very name, therefore, may be regarded as indicating the origin of the nation which bore it. But there are, further, these two remarkable facts. *The district whence Herodotus derives the Scûths is the district where the Ten Tribes must have settled, if they were to help the Medes. And, the account given by Herodotus of the Scûthic migration from Asia into Europe is identical with Ezra’s account of the migration of the Ten Tribes from Media to Arsareth.* That such is the case, I will show clearly by and by. Meanwhile, I will clear up some apparent difficulties in a portion of the geography of Herodotus—apparent only, for on a careful examination of his own words, they are seen not to exist. Nevertheless, many writers have been troubled about them, and many impossible hypotheses have been framed with a view to get over them.

\* *Vide supra*, pp. 11, 12.

† The correct phonetic form is *Scûth*, as pointed out by Mr. Cockburn-Muir in *The Berwick Lectures*. Hence it will be so spelt throughout these pages.



In the first place, there is a river *Araxes*, which is often mentioned in one portion of the work of Herodotus.\* It rises, he says, in the Matienian mountains, which divide Media and Armenia from Assyria, and form the watershed between the Caspian river-systems and the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris. Its course is "*towards the rising sun.*" It has forty mouths, of which all but one issue into pools and shallow water; but by the remaining one the river flows in a clear course into the Caspian Sea. And, lastly, "*people say*" that the river has islands frequently occurring in it, "about the size of Lesbos." There can be no manner of doubt as to what river is meant. It can be none other than the great river of Armenia, which to this day still bears the name of *Arás*. And yet different commentators have supposed that in certain passages this river must be the Oxus or the Jaxartes, rivers of Turkestan, flowing towards the *setting* sun! or even the Volga, which flows towards *no* sun at all! But why these marvellous suppositions, so wildly confounding all the points of the compass? The "islands as big as Lesbos" present no difficulty. *People* said they were there, not Herodotus. But why should there not have been such things? In the delta, at the mouth of the united Kúr and Arás, there is now such an island, quite as large as Lesbos (the modern Mitylene), and if, as is supposed, the Arás and the Kúr once entered the sea by independent mouths, such islands may have "frequently" occurred. As to the number of mouths ending in "pools and shallow water," the ground on either side of the united Kúr and Arás shows abundant traces of this still. A number of small lakes, or salt-pans, a number of straggling off-shoots from the river, and one clear mouth—such is the manner in which the Arás of to-day enters the Caspian Sea.

The ultimate explanation of the confused ideas of the commentators is to be found in the mention in two or three places† in the history of Herodotus of a people called *Massagétai*, sometimes in connection with the Araxes, once as dwelling to the east of the Caspian Sea. To consider this last passage first, the words of Herodotus are these: "The Caspian Sea is a separate sea by itself, unconnected with the Mediterranean, Black Sea, or any other part of the ocean. Immediately beyond its *eastern* shore lies a plain, boundless *to the view*, the greater part of which the Massagétai have a share

\* Book I., chap. 201—216; also, Book IV., chap. 11, 12, and 40.

† I., 201 and 204—216; also IV., 11, 12.

in."\* Now this is a description of the Caspian Sea and its surroundings, not of any arrangement of peoples. It does *not* say, Here, and nowhere else, dwell this nation called Massagétai. The plain was partly occupied by the Massagétai, but there is nothing about their being confined to this particular plain east of the Caspian. Bearing this in mind, let us return to the Scüths of Herodotus. According to his account, which was, he says, common to both Greeks and barbarians, *the Scüths, in consequence of being hard pressed in war by the Massagétai, crossed the river Araxes and came to the Kimmerian land.* The Kimmerian land of Herodotus included† the modern *Crimea*, and the part of Southern Russia immediately adjoining, to the north-west. The Araxes was, as we have seen, the Arás in Armenia. Hence, in order to reach Kimmeria by crossing the Araxes, the Scüths must have dwelt south of the Araxes. Where then were the Massagétai, who pressed the Scüths so hard?

Herodotus tells us that in his day (circ. B.C. 450) this tribe lived on fish, "which the river Araxes produces in abundance." He further tells us that Cyrus, the great king of Persia, in B.C. 530, crossed the Araxes to invade their country, which lay just beyond; therefore, at that date, they were living just to the north of the Araxes. Now, since in the earlier period, before the migration of the Scüths, it was pressure from the Massagétai which caused the Scüths to cross the Araxes, they must have been living on the banks of the Araxes at that time also.

Now we can see where the Massagétai were, when they fought against the Scüths. South of the Arás, or Araxes, in the latter half of its course, is a tract of country, part plain, part rising ground, about 200 miles long from east to west, and 50 miles across from north to south, where the rising ground culminates in the northern mountain range of Media. This range, running from east to west, separates the Araxes valley from Lake Urumiah and the river Uzan, or Gozan. At the western end of this mountain chain, about fifty miles distant from the Caspian, there is an offshoot running due north almost to the banks of the Araxes. Between this chain and the Caspian Sea lies another plain, about forty miles across from east to west, and extending along the shore of the Caspian to the foot of the Caucasus on the further side of the Araxes. This latter plain, extending on both sides of the last fifty miles of the course of the river, was the country occupied by that portion of the Massagétai

\* *μετέχουσι*, "share with others."

† IV., 11, 12.

which harassed the Scüths. Indeed it was, in all probability, the home of the Massagétan Horde, whence, at a later period, they sent forth a colony to the plain on the other side of the Caspian. It has lately occurred to me that it may even be possible to discover who these Massagétai were. Herodotus tells us that "there are some people who go so far as to call them a Scüthic tribe," that is, a portion of the great Scüthic nation. The name itself—note the accent on the last syllable but one—I take to mean "Great Wanderers"; being compounded of the Zendic *mas* "great," and *sagétai* or *sgétai*, which is the same as *scüthai*. For the name of Scüth experienced two modifications; one being the insertion of a vowel between the initial letter and the guttural, the other being the loss of the initial *s* altogether, whence arose the forms *Getai* and *Goth*. Now if the Massagétai were related, either by race or language, to the Scüths, and if the Scüths were Israel, then the Massagétai must have been some family so related to Israel. Now in B.C. 740 the king of Assyria deported the *Syrians of Damascus* to *Kir*, which is the country watered by the joint Araxes and *Kür*,\* the plain, that is, about the mouth of the Araxes, both to the north and to the south. But this is the very district where, for an indefinite period previous to B.C. 655, these Massagétai dwelt. It seems, therefore, obvious, that the Syrians of Damascus, if not identical with the Massagétai, must at least have been living amongst them.

Such, then, were the people who occupied that one of the two plains described above, which bordered the Caspian Sea. *The other plain, extending parallel to the Araxes, and to the south of that river, was the country occupied by the Scüths themselves.*

I will now refer the reader back to the point where I came to the conclusion that the Ten Tribes, during the early years of the Median independence, occupied the country intervening between the northern mountain range of Media and the river Araxes. He will see that I have now shown precisely the same district to have been in the occupation of the Scüths. Secondly, the period is the same. The date of the end of Israel's sojourn in that region was shown to be B.C. 655. Now it will be proved in a later chapter that the Scüthic migration cannot have taken place many years after the year 650, nor again more than a few years before. Hence, again, we approximate to the date 655. Thirdly, there is the evidence of names. *Scüths* we have already con-

\* The *Kür*-us of Strabo, generally spelt *Cyrus*, and mispronounced.

sidered. But *Sakai* was a synonym, with the Persians, for the name Scüths, and is, as will be seen in the next chapter, one of the names belonging to outcast Israel. How, then, I would ask—going upon this evidence alone—could there have been two different peoples, occupying the same small and well-defined tract of country, during the same period, and with common names? Can any one, having before him the evidence already adduced, fail to see that the Scüths and the Israelites were one and the same? But what if I go on to show that *of the Israelitish migration and the Scüthic migration, described respectively by Ezra and Herodotus, the point of departure and the point of arrival are the same?* I say “go on to show,” but it is shown already. This unexpected fact is contained in different parts of these latter pages. Still I will now attempt to set it forth clearly by itself, when, I hope, none will fail to grasp its full significance. The two small maps, prepared to illustrate this point, will cause it to be more easily realized than the clearest account in words. They will also help the reader to comprehend more easily the following detailed account of the Migration.

The western end of the plain, where Scüthic Israel was dwelling, is bounded by the mountains of Armenia, which are entered by low passes, on the north-west and south-west. The latter of these would lead the migrating nation direct to the shores of Lake Van; thence round the north-eastern end of that lake, through another pass, to the banks of the Eastern Euphrates, here known as *Murad-su*, a name which looks suspiciously like the Hebrew *morad*, “descent.” At the very point where, following this route, they must have first reached the Euphrates, there is a town whose name is spelt variously as *Mel-ash-kert*, or *Mel-as-gerd*. (This form *ash-kert* or *as-gerd* occurs in local names several times along the route likely to have been followed. Its significance I reserve for a subsequent chapter.) After advancing almost due north-east for about fifty miles along the right bank of the *Murad-su*, they would come to a point where they would be obliged to cross the river, unless they wished to return to the country they had left—a point about sixty miles from the source of this branch of the Euphrates. Here, then, were the “*narrow passages of the Euphrates*,” where the Lord kept back the waters till the people had passed to the other side. The only direction in which they could now proceed was almost due west, to the central watershed of Armenia. Crossing this, they found themselves once more in the valley of the Araxes, but this time among its sources. They now turned sharp north-east and *crossed the Araxes*. The point

where they passed through the Euphrates, according to Ezra, and their passage of the Araxes, according to Herodotus, were only fifty miles apart. And this route is, as I have said before, the one natural route, for it is the very line along which the Russian and Turkish armies alternately advanced and retreated in the war of 1876.

To resume : fifty miles more after the passage of the Araxes would bring the advancing host to the pass in the mountain chain separating Erzerûm from Kars. Just at this point a river rises and flows down northwards to the Black Sea. Its name, in its upper course, is in one map given as *Israel-su*,—Israel river. Has this no significance? Does it not seem a trace of the one name which the wanderers were to lose, a trace solitary indeed, from the nature of the case, but yet sufficient to point out with certainty to future ages the paths of the exiled and wandering nation. To find such a name is indeed surprising, but it speaks in unmistakable tones.

Down this valley, then, advanced the host of Israel, and in a short time reached the edge of the Black Sea, where now stands the port of Batoum, in the country of the Lazis, once in Turkish, but now in Russian, hands.

From Batoum, across the Phasis, and thence skirting the coast, or through the passes near Mt. Elburz and so along the northern edge of the Caucasus, north-west, their course now lay. Crossing the neck of the Sea of Azov, the Kimmerian Bosphorus—now known as the straits of Kertch or Yeni-kaleh—they passed through the Crimea, and across the river Dniepr, or Borysthenes, to the banks of the Tyras. This river, the modern Dniestr, rising in the same mountains as the *Sereth*, flows in a course parallel to that river, and at no point far distant from it. In arriving at this point, the Ten Tribes, after journeying through country requiring fully a year and a half to traverse, *had arrived at the district of Arsareth*. At the same time, *the Scüths had come to the Kimmerian land*. Thus we find that the points of arrival in the two accounts, as well as the points of departure, are identical. And in the nature of the case, the routes, implied by the two condensed accounts, must have been the same route. Thus do the accounts of Ezra and of Herodotus agree.

It is no objection to say that the motives attributed in the two accounts are different. Neither professes to be a complete account. Both, indeed, are terse enough. Nor does it follow that, because Herodotus mentions the growing power of a nomad horde as the immediate cause of the migration of the Scüths, there had been no settled purpose, formed long before, and which was the ultimate

reason for their action. Nor, again, because Ezra has recorded that settled purpose, which was "that they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land," does it follow that the putting into action of that purpose was not due to some such operative reason as that mentioned by Herodotus. Moreover Herodotus himself tells us, when he gives his detailed description of the Scüths, that they clung tenaciously to their own customs, and looked with suspicion and aversion upon those of other nations.

The Scüthic migration and its attendant circumstances have been treated at great length. But the fact, which I believe to be established in these pages, is one of the highest importance: it is this:—*The Ten Tribes, lost to view in Media towards the close of the eighth century B.C., have been found in Europe, in the middle of the seventh century, as the Scüths of Herodotus.*

One question more. *Who were the Kimmerians*, whom the Scüths found dwelling in the country of Arsareth? *They also were Israelites.* They bear one of the names of outcast Israel, one by which we have already traced "the remnant that escaped"—viz., the name of *Khumri*. Their historical achievements prove, like those of the Scüths—and both points will be seen in the next chapter but one—to be the prophesied achievements of Israel while wandering among the Gentile nations. How they came, I know not. But they could not well have been in the captivity, for Ezra's account deals with those Israelites who escaped into Europe from Media. They must, therefore, have escaped from the land of Israel during the period of Assyrian invasion. But is there any evidence of this? I know of none except this, which I take from a pamphlet by Colonel Gawler, entitled *Our Scythian Ancestors Identified with Israel*.<sup>\*</sup> In this the author refers to "a book written by a Jew, the Rev. M. Sailman, in 1818, entitled, *Researches in the East; an Important Account of the Ten Tribes.*" Mr. Sailman "states (pp. 20, 21) that *many of the people did not go into captivity, but evaded the calamity, going off with their flocks, and turning nomads, and that the chief or prince, whom they appointed, could muster 120,000 horse and 100,000 foot.*" Such a fact as this would amply satisfy the question of the Kimmerians. They would thus escape about the middle of the eighth century B.C., and penetrate in course of time to the north-western shores of the Black Sea. However, this chapter is already extended, and I will reserve for the present my remaining evidence to show that the Kimmerians also, as well as the Scüths, were of the stock of Israel of Samaria.

<sup>\*</sup> p. 9.



## CHAPTER VII.

### THE SAXONS OF THE EAST.

*An Offshoot of Israel to the East—"The Saxons of the East and the West"—The Scythic Sakai—Saca-suni—The Parthian Empires—Buddhism—Sakya Muni—Confucius—Absorption Impossible for Wandering Israel—The Sakhs in India—The Afghan Beni-Israel—The Broken Link Found.*

**P**ROPHECY came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The prophets of Jehovah delivered His messages to the chosen people, and through them to the modern world. But the world runs on and readeth not, though he who runs may read.

The two great themes of all the prophets are, first, the manner of Messiah's coming, both the first coming and the second; next, the future destinies of the two branches of the chosen nation up to the time of the end. Both of them were to be carried into captivity. But the one portion, Israel of Samaria, the Ten Tribes, were to be completely removed, and then to wander away north, south, east, and west. The main body, it is true, were to go to the west and to the north. "Isles of the west" (not "of the sea," for "Isles of the sea" is a pleonasm alien to the Hebrew language) were to receive them, such isles forming a north country, as regards Palestine. However, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, offshoots must have penetrated into the regions of the south and the east.

In the year 1861 there was published a remarkable book, of which the full title is as follows:—"The Lost Tribes and the Saxons of the East and the West, with new views of Buddhism, and Translations of Rock Records in India." The author—George Moore, M.D.—proves, beyond possibility of doubt, the migration eastward into the interior of Asia of a body of Israelites, which has not only left its mark most plainly on the history of Asia for many centuries, but has also permanently influenced the religious thought of hundreds

of millions throughout the continent. Moreover, this migration has been attended with results so important to the British nation and its great empire in India, that it is difficult to realize that now, twenty years after its first appearance, the book which proves it is still known to but a few.

"A certain class of Israelites, and that a large one," so Dr. Moore \* has shown, "is *not* to be restored to Palestine, and yet they are, as a body, to be removed from the place of their exile: '*I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me; I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and [or, but] they shall NOT enter into the land of Israel.*'† Notwithstanding this, mercy accompanies the rebels." Amos, also, apparently referring to the same point, says,‡ "And they shall wander from sea to sea, and *from the north even to the east*; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the LORD, and shall not find it."

The name Scüths, which, at the beginning of the Christian æra, was applied indiscriminately to all the peoples of northern Europe and Asia, was restricted in Herodotus to one particular race, the race to whom the name belonged by right. One portion, of which he gives a detailed description, dwelt in Europe. Another portion occupied part of Asia to the east of the Caspian Sea. Of the latter he says in one passage§ that "they are Scüths, more especially called Amyrgian Scüths; but called by the Persians *Sakai*, for the Persians call all Scüths *Sakai*." Now if the Scüthic nation be Israel, then it follows that these Amyrgian Scüths, being part of that nation, must be part of Israel. But this very name of *Sakai* affords further proof that the Scüthic nation is Israel, for it is one of the names under which captive Israel was to be looked for. This point is best shown in the words used by Dr. Moore.|| "The word *Sacæ* or *Sakai* is remarkable in the history of language, and the philologists have been unable satisfactorily to trace its origin. The word *Isaac* is equally remarkable; but we are told its derivation in the story of Isaac's parentage and home-life. It is from פֶּטַח, and means laughter, either as expressive of derision, incredulity, or joy. The initial I is not essential to it, and is, perhaps, prefixed to make it a personal as well as a prophetic designation. Now as we find this name adopted by the house of Israel, and applied to them by the prophet Amos, who denounced them and their idolatries in this

\* p. 55.

† Ezek. xx. 38.

‡ viii. 12.

§ vii. 64.

|| p. 97.



name, not long before their banishment, we have only to discover reason and occasion for their using this designation afterwards, to account at once for the name *Sacae* and all that is connected with it. In Amos (vii. 9) the word *Isaac* is employed as synonymous with *Israel*. It was after the tribes of *Israel* had separated themselves from *Judah*, and thus also from the hopes and promises connected with the house of *David*, that they acquired this name." Again,\* "*Saca-suni* (the name of those *Sakai* who occupied part of *Armenia*) is equivalent in Hebrew to "the changed *Saks*," שכישי; not sons of *Sak*, but *Saks* that had altered their abode or their character . . . . The name *Sacae* was applied to them first as simply *the Tribes*, perhaps adopted from themselves; but ultimately it came to signify 'bowmen,' because they, like the *Ephraimites* and the *English*,† were so famous for the use of the bow."

No annals of the Median Empire survive from which we might have learnt the approximate date when this body of *Israelites* settled in the country to the east of the *Caspian*. In all probability, however, this event occurred shortly before the close of the seventh century B.C. During the reign of *Cyrus*, the founder of the *Persian Empire*, they remained free. Brought, after his death, within the limits of that Empire, they fought with conspicuous bravery in the armies which *Darius Hystaspis* and *Xerxes* sent to invade *Greece*. Their subsequent history, during a period of many centuries, is set forth in the following words of *Dr. Moore*.‡ "They had detached themselves from *Persia* before *Alexander's* invasion. Independently they fought as allies of *Darius* at *Arbela*. They contended with *Alexander's* army without dishonour. A century later they established their rule from the *Aral lake* to the mouths of the *Indus*. They then invaded central *India*, but then fell under the dominion of the *Parthians*—probably of the same race—and, finally, were absorbed in the kingdom of the *Sassanids*, also *Saxon*, pretty much as the *Saxons* of *England* have become blended with the *Normans*, or *Northmen*, and the *Danes*, all traceable to the same *Saxon* source."

Now the religion of these *Sakai*, the *Sakhs* of *Indian* history, proves to be *Buddhism*. And the rock inscriptions, left in *India* and *Turkestan* by the early founders of *Buddhism*, prove to be *Hebrew*. The evidence for these two points runs through the whole of the 400 pages of *Dr. Moore's* wonderful book, so that it is impossible to

\* p. 89.

† Italics mine.

‡ p. 91.

reproduce it here. I can only hope that many of my readers may be as fortunate as myself in obtaining perusal of the book itself. This much, however, I will mention. The Hebrew root *Buddh* means "alone."\* *Budii* means "the separated people," and occurs as a tribal name both in ancient Media, and in connection with the Scüths in Europe. "They shall seek for the word of the LORD, and shall not find it"—such had been the decree of Jehovah by the mouth of Amos, and it is conspicuously fulfilled in the Buddhist religion. The rock-inscriptions of early Buddhism are one great wail of desolation, of ruin ever present, and hope all gone.

The founder of Buddhism was a prince of the Sakan or Scüthic race, himself bearing the name of *Sakya*, or, more fully, *Sakya Muni*. Born in India about the year B.C. 623, at an early age he had risen to be prince of the surrounding peoples, and the ascendancy, thus early gained in the land of exile, he used as the means for inculcating a purer religion into the minds of the different tribes of Hindustân. For forty years he laboured, and before he died had established a religious system, second only to the Christian system, the history of which it much resembles. To illustrate the wonderful nature of this work, I will quote again from Dr. Moore.† "The man who, during forty years' preaching, had overturned many tyrannies—inculcated charity and chastity where both had been unknown—declared perfect equality between high caste and low, and founded hospitals for the halt, the blind, and the destitute, placing a trained physician at stated intervals, for the help of the afflicted, along the highways—who had sent out his missionaries, fired with his own zeal and enlightened by his intelligence, to teach kindness everywhere, and the performance of a thoughtful devotion as the means of delivering the soul from evil—the man that had raised woman to her right place, at the side and in the heart of man—the man that had not only erected a new system of religion upon thought concerning the perishable and the everlasting, but also thus promoted and enforced the highest moral reform known in the world before Christianity appeared—the man that had remodelled the *languages*, as well as the ideas, of the people over whom he reigned, by directing the compilation of new Sanskrit and *Pali* grammars (probably with a view to the incorporation of Hebrew in a Pali form)—the man qualified to accomplish such things was a man likely to be missed."

\* So used in Hosea viii. 9, of Israel.

† p. 184.

Missed he was, and that sorely, for soon there crept into Buddhism a series of innovations, like those which came into the early Christian Church, and the Buddhism of to-day is but a very poor reflex of the beautiful teaching of the great Sakya.

Wonderful, however, as this man was in all his work, still more wonderful was the doctrine which he preached, which was none other than the promise, first delivered to the mother of the human race, of the seed of the woman who should come in the fullness of time to crush the serpent's head. He foretold *the future coming of the Lord of the world, who, destroying the serpent, should bring peace, and who should spring from the Sakyan race.* "In Isaac shall thy seed be called."

Further east, amongst that ancient nation the Chinese, and almost contemporaneously with Sakya, another great reformer was doing the same work, and he too must have been, as it seems to me, of the elect generations. This was *Confucius*, born B.C. 584, the preacher of purer religion to China, and the denouncer of the vice and immorality of the times. "To treat others according to the treatment which they themselves would desire at their hands," "to guard their secret *thoughts*"; that "true renown consists in straightforward and honest sincerity, in the love of justice, in the knowledge of mankind, and in humility,"—such were some of his instructions to the Chinese. He advocated the "law of retaliation" so prominent in the Mosaic code; and he is called to the present day, "The most holy teacher of ancient times."

Now to whatever remote portions of the earth these Israelitish wanderers may have penetrated, their descendants must still survive. They might indeed, yet in the nature of the case not all, have been exterminated in war, but *they could never become absorbed* into the nations among whom they dwelt. For thus saith the LORD, by the mouth of His prophet Amos:\* "*Lo, I will command, and I will sift the House of Israel among all nations; like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth.*" Yet, "All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword, which say, The evil shall not overtake nor prevent us." Absorption, therefore, was impossible for every section of wandering Israel, and at every period of their wanderings. In this light we may consider this most striking fact in connection with Confucius, "that though only a single descendant survived Confucius, *the succession has*

\* ix. 9, 10.

*continued* through sixty-seven or sixty-eight generations *to the present day, in the very district where their great ancestor was born.* Various honours and privileges have always distinguished the family."\* Add to this the tradition current among the Hebrews in the ninth century A.D., and set forth in the "Narrative of Eldad the Danite," that some of the Ten Tribes reached China. I must add that this about Confucius did not, as far as I am aware, occur to Dr. Moore, from whose book the matter of the greater part of this chapter is taken. It seems, however, to me, to harmonize entirely with his wonderful discoveries in connection with Buddhism and the Sakai.

Whether *Zoroaster*, the law-giver of the Medes, whose date is given by one writer as about B.C. 600, by another as the time of Daniel's power at Babylon, was also of the favoured Sakan race, I do not know. I am, however, strongly inclined to believe so. *Cyrus* too, the founder of the mighty Persian Empire, raised up, under the special designation of "the servant of the LORD," to restore the Jews, and whose work was foretold in prophecy—he too may well have been of the Sakai. Such speculations cease to seem wild, when we consider that God chose one people to be His "servants" and "witnesses," to "show forth His praise among the nations," and to be the vehicle of blessing to "all families of the earth." Quite certainly will it be seen to be true that all the purer religion and philosophy of the ancient world came from contact with the Hebrew race. Thus, for instance, we have already seen one writer adducing proof bearing on the Hebrew origin of the Sibylline leaves of early Roman history.† Again, *Pythagoras*, from whom much of the later philosophy was derived, is said to have acknowledged as his teacher the prophet *Ezekiel*.‡ To say the least, therefore, it is no improbability to suppose that the great reformers of the heathen, five or six centuries before the advent of Christ, belonged to the same favoured race.

But I must return to the "Saxons of the East and of the West." Time, space, and the patience of my readers would all fail me, were I to attempt to put into my own words all the facts discovered by the author of that book. The entry into India of a joint army of Sakhs and Yávanas (*i.e.*, Greeks) under Alexander the Great

\* Davis's *Chinese* II., 44.

† A full analysis of this matter is also to be found in the invaluable book on *Ethnic Inspiration*, by the Rev. J. Taylor Goodsir, F.R.S.E. Williams and Norgate.—C. M.

‡ I owe this to one who had seen it years ago in *Stanley's Life of Pythagoras*. Ezekiel is supposed to figure under the name Nazartus.

(himself, in all probability, as I pointed out above, an Argive Israelite of the stock of Dan)—the subsequent Sakan conquest of the Panjáb—the connection between the Sakai and the two great Parthian dynasties, that of the *Arsakids*, and that of the *Sassanids*, each of which was periodically victorious over the armies of Imperial Rome—the survival of the Sakai themselves through the Khozars or Kosi of the dark ages, to the *ruling Afghans* of the present day—all these facts are shown at length by Dr. Moore. The so-called Tatar dynasty of the Khozars,\* who, leaving their homes on the edge of the Caspian Sea, became the lords of Central India from the sixth century to the tenth, are the link between the Sakhs or Sakai of the older æra and their modern descendants in Bokhara and Afghanistan. "Their sovereigns," says Dr. Moore, "had, as early as the tenth century, been from time immemorial *Hebrews*." But apart from this historical link, there is abundant evidence as to the Israelitish origin of certain sections of the present occupants of Central Asia, on either side of the Hindû-Kûsh. They personally resemble the Hebrew family. The Afghan Pathans have always called themselves *Beni Israel*, still all the while expressing the strongest contempt for the *Jews*. Among their tribal names are those of Yussuf-szye, or tribe of Joseph, and Izak-szye, tribe of Isaac. Moreover, Hebrew names, both of places and of persons, are far too numerous "to be accounted for through Mahometan association, and, indeed, these names existed before the Afghans became Mahometans." The name by which they call themselves is not Afghan, but Pathan. Their language, known as Pushtû, is said to contain more Hebrew roots than any other. The traditions of the Afghans fully support this varied evidence of language. One more small point of interest may be noted. The name *Cábul*, applied at once to the capital, to the river on which that capital stands, and to the country of the Afghans, and spelt anciently *Cábura*, is the precise phonetic equivalent of Habor, one of the places in the land of Israel's captivity; and near *Cábura*, Ptolemy placed a nation whom he calls *Aristophyli*, or "the Noble Tribes."

Nor is it only in districts outside our Indian Empire that these Beni-Israel are found. They occur in different parts of Hindustân itself. They can even be traced in further India, on the borders of Burmah and Siam. *Israel in Britain* and *Israel in India*, separated by a long stretch of centuries, but now, in these latter years,


brought by the guiding hand of Jehovah in close connection once again! How wonderful is this! And there is this further striking fact, that though the evidence for Israel in India, the historical evidence I mean, has been before the British nation now for twenty years, it has yet made next to no way at all; waiting, as I take it, the clear exposition of the historical evidence for Israel in Britain. Dr. Moore himself was within almost a hair's breadth of tracing Israel into Britain, but seemed kept back from seeing it. That his mind often dwelt on it is clear from the words I now proceed to quote, which are certainly among the most striking in the whole book.\*

"The revolutionizing influence of the Saxons, who, in olden time, took possession of a great part of India, was certainly no less marked than that of the Saxons who emigrated westwards. So that, if it can be shown that the Saxons had any connections with the descendants of Isaac, or were, in their origin, of the same race, then it follows that we ought to find indications of their dominance through their opinions in the East as well as in the West, but more especially in India. And if we Englishmen are only a branch of the same stock that at an early period revolutionized India, and still maintain the influence of their religious ideas throughout the East, how wonderful and interesting is the providential position of England at present in respect to our Eastern dominion! *If we could but clearly demonstrate our unbroken descent as Englishmen from the House of Isaac. . . . Could we but find the broken link in the chain. . . . But the link is broken,* the connection between the Sakai and the House of Israel has not been found."

*The broken link has now been found.* I have little doubt but that the reader who has the patience to wade through my essay to the end, will see this as clearly as I myself see it now. But I must not anticipate. He must suspend his judgment till he be in a position to grasp the whole of my argument.


\* pp. 91 to 95.





## SCÜTH - LAND,

*Sorrelite Migrations shown thus.*







## CHAPTER VIII.

### TREADING DOWN AND TEARING IN PIECES.

*Scythians and Kimmerians—Chronology—The Kimmerians in Lydia—The Scythians in Media—Both expelled—Israel on the Black Sea. B.C. 654 to 600.*

**S**CYTHS and Kimmerians—these are names which were household words throughout the nations of Western Asia long after the period of the great achievements to which the fame attaching to these names was due. This period was the latter half of the seventh century before the Christian æra.

In order to show my grounds for affixing precise dates to certain

TABLE ILLUSTRATING THE CHRONOLOGY OF PARTS OF THE 8TH, 7TH, AND 6TH CENTURIES B.C., FROM THE DATA FURNISHED BY HERODOTUS.

KINGS OF LYDIA.	DATES.	KINGS OF MEDIA.
GYGES, <i>began to reign.</i>	724.	DEIOKES.
<i>Commencement of the ravages of the Kimmerians. Gyges killed by them.</i>	708.	
ARDYS.	686.	PHRAORTES.
<i>The Kimmerian invasion of Asia Minor</i>	655.	
SADYATTES.	637.	KYAXARES. <i>Scythic invasion of Media, and their domination over "Asia" for 28 years, ending in the year</i>
<i>continuing</i>	633.	
ALYATTES.	628.	
<i>until their expulsion by Alyattes.</i>	625.	
	600.	ASTYAGES.
CROESUS.	593.	
	568.	Astyages deposed by Cyrus.
Croesus deposed by Cyrus.	558.	
	554.	

events, I insert a table showing the chronology as derived from Herodotus. It exhibits the contemporaneous history of the Median and Lydian monarchies, both of which were affected by the Scüthic and Kimmerian power. The dates are given on the supposition that the death of Cyrus occurred, as is generally supposed, in the year B.C. 530. But those given for the Lydian kings further depend on the accuracy of B.C. 554 for the capture of Sardes by Cyrus, by which event the Lydian empire came to an end. And a careful study of the historical account given by Herodotus shows that the fall of Sardes followed only a few years after the establishment of Cyrus on the throne of Media.

The Kimmerian ravages in the reign of Gyges are derived from the Assyrian inscriptions. Herodotus only mentions one Kimmerian invasion of Asia Minor, occurring in the latter part of the reign of Ardys, and therefore approximately B.C. 650. This invasion he connects with the arrival of the Scüths on the banks of the river Tyras, which bounded the Kimmerian land. And to this event I assigned, in a previous chapter, the date B.C. 654. According to Herodotus, the Kimmerians abandoned their country to the Scüths, and proceeded to overrun the whole of Asia Minor. The Scüths, he says, followed them, and invaded Media. He does not say that they followed them immediately. And his history of the Lydian and Median monarchies proves that there was a considerable interval between the two invasions. This much is clear to me. *During the latter half of the seventh century B.C., the whole of Western Asia was overrun by powerful bands of Israelites. They invaded Asia Minor as Kimmerians, about B.C. 650, and Media, with the rest of Western Asia, as Scüths in the year 628. The success which attended each invasion may be seen from the descriptions here appended.*

Professor Rawlinson, in his translation of Herodotus, gives us the following striking account of the Kimmerian invasion. He tells us that they "*carried ruin and desolation over all the fairest regions of Lower Asia. Paphlagonia, Bithynia, Ionia, Phrygia, even Cilicia, as well as Lydia, were plundered and laid waste; in Phrygia, Midas, the king, despairing of any effectual resistance, on the approach of the dreaded foe, is said to have committed suicide; in Lydia, they took Sardes, the capital; in Ionia, they ravaged the valley of the Cayster, besieged Ephesus, and, according to some accounts, burnt the temple of Diana in its vicinity, after which they sacked the City of Magnesia. It was only in the third generation that the Lydian princes were able*

to expel them from the territories in their dominion." This description takes us at once to that nation which was called "Israel, the LORD's *Battle Axe*," and we may well feel certain that here we have "the remnant of Jacob *among the Gentiles in the midst of many people*, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, who, if he go through, both *treadeth down* and *teareth in pieces*, and *none can deliver*."

The other invasion, that of the Scüths, I will describe in Herodotus's own words.\* This, like the other, was another striking instance of "treading down and tearing in pieces," and this time in the very country whither, a century before, they had been carried into captivity. "The Scüths, having invaded Media, were opposed by the Medes, who gave them battle, but, being defeated, lost their empire. *The Scüths became masters of Asia*. Thence they marched against Egypt; and when they had reached Palestine, Psammitichus the King of Egypt, having sent to meet them with gifts and entreaties, induced them to advance no further. Thereupon they set off back, and were in Askalon, when, after the greater number had passed through without doing harm, a few remaining behind plundered the temple of Aphrodite, Queen of Heaven, the oldest temple to that goddess. . . . The dominion of the Scüths over Asia lasted twenty-eight years, during which their insolence and oppression *spread ruin on every side*; they scoured the country and plundered every-one of whatever they could."

Meanwhile the Kimmerian supremacy came to an end. While they "went through," they carried everthing before them, but when their will to "go through" failed, their power to "tread down" and "tear in pieces" failed also; and a "deliverer" was at length found in King Alyattes of Lydia, who, not long after his accession, drove them out of Asia. In the year 600 the Medes also found a "deliverer" in Kyaxares, who invited the leading Scüths to a banquet, and massacred them. The expelled remnants of both, as I believe, gradually found their way back to the main mass of the nation of Israel. The close of the seventh century before the Christian æra saw them permanently settled in the district watered by the Sereth and neighbouring rivers, flowing into the Danube and the Black Sea.

The name Kimmerians does not occur again, as applied to a portion of the Scüthic nation, until the close of the second century B.C., when it re-appears in almost precisely the same form. There is evidence for supposing that Herodotus regarded the Kimmerians as

\* I., 104, 5, 6.

occupying part of their former country long after the first appearance of the Scüths. He tells us that they were expelled from Asia, but mentions that they had previously founded a colony at Sinope on the southern shore of the Black Sea, and implies that they retained this colony after their supremacy in Asia Minor had been lost. Some writers suppose that they migrated westwards, and entered Britain as the Kymry, but a more satisfactory explanation of the origin of the Kymry in Britain has been given by me in an earlier chapter.

All the mentions by early writers of the Kimmerian horde entirely fall in with the account which takes the Kimmerians from the land of Israel to the northern shores of the Black Sea, in or before the middle of the eighth century B.C. Homer, writing in the latter half of that century, or towards the beginning of the next, and himself it may be of that stock of Dan which played so important a part in the early so-called Greek colonization, refers to them in his *Odyssey* as dwelling

*Ἡέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλλυμμένοι· οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοῦς*

*Ἡέλιος φαέθων ἐπιλάμπεται ἀκτίνεσσιν, . . . .*

*Ἄλλ' ἐπὶ νύξ' ὅλοῃ τέταται.*

These words of Homer have much exercised the ingenuity of the commentators. Strabo, the geographer, understands them as referring to the home of the Kimmerians on the shores of the Black Sea. To take another early mention of the name, an inroad of the Kimmerians into Asia Minor is recorded by the Assyrian inscriptions as occurring in the reign of Esarhaddon, or about the close of the eighth century B.C. And in this account they are described as a nomad horde. I will now dismiss the name Kimmerians, and proceed to the later history of Scüthic Israel, where there is less matter for speculation; where too there is much that is certain, and much that is important.





## CHAPTER IX.

### ISRAEL SETTLED ON THE BLACK SEA.

*No King—Darius invades Scüthia—The Getai—Zal-moxis—Darius retires—Tar-gitaus—Visit of Herodotus to Scüthia—His information: 1. Geography of Scüthia, 2. Language, 3. National Character, 4. Manners and Customs—Scüthic corn trade—The Getae north of the Danube—Immigration of Galatians into Scüthia. B.C. 600 to 115.*

**T**HE close of the seventh century B.C., saw both the commencement of the settlement in Europe of Scüthic-Israel, and the rise of the first of Daniel's four great world-empires, Babylon. This is what was to be expected, for the Fifth Empire was to grow with them all. "*In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed.*"\* Of the history of their first century, during which the Scüths gradually spread from the shores of the Black Sea almost to the Baltic, we have only a succession of military leaders—chieftains merely, not 'kings' as the Greeks called them. Indeed, the condition of the nation—nomads at all times—prevented their having any settled government. During all these centuries they were "many days without a king."

The probable dates of these chiefs are given by Prof. Rawlinson.† First, about 660, Sparga-pithes, and Madyas, the latter directing the invasion of Media; 620, Lycus; 590, Gnurus; 560, Saulius and Anacharsis; 520, Idanthysus, with whom were associated two others, the three being merely described as commanding three divisions of the Scüthic army, yet all called by the Greeks "kings." Towards the close of this century, however, they are once more brought into contact with the rulers of Asia. In 508 Darius,‡ the king of Persia, resolved to in-

\* Dan. ii. 44.

† Translation of Herodotus, III., 70.

‡ The Behistun Inscription records an expedition of Darius against the Sacae (Saka), which Prof. Rawlinson (Hdt. III. 1) thinks may refer to this.

vade their country, in order to punish them for their subjection of the Medes a century before. Accordingly he crossed the Bosphorus, where Constantinople now stands, and after advancing northwards through Thrace, descended through the passes of the Balkans into the plains of Bulgaria. Here he met with a stubborn resistance from the first portion of the Scüthic race, who had gradually occupied the whole district between the Danube and the Balkans. These had come to be known as *Getai* (i.e., S-cüthai, the first letter being lost). "Obstinately defending themselves, they were forthwith enslaved, notwithstanding that they are the *noblest* as well as the *most just* of all the Thracian tribes."\* Herodotus describes them in language which points to their having been not only Israelites, but Israelites who preserved the true religion, and had separated themselves from their idolatrous brethren on the north of the Danube. "They believe," says the historian, "in their *immortality*, and that there is *no other God but their own*. They think that they do not really die, but that when they depart this life they go to *Zal-Moxis*." The mysterious disappearance assigned to this hero, his supposed association with Pythagoras, the pupil of Ezekiel, while Herodotus believed that he lived long before the time of Pythagoras, and supposed he might be a native god of the Getae; and, finally, the addition of Strabo that he acquired his knowledge in Egypt, makes it more than probable that, as has been pointed out by Col. Gawler and Mr. Savile, this name is nothing but a Greek corruption of *Moses*, with the prefix *Sar*, "lord." It is also a striking evidence\* that a town on the south bank of the Danube, near its mouth, bears the name *Isak-cha* to the present day.

Darius, having with difficulty subdued the Getae, crossed the Danube into Scüthia. The Scüths, having obtained aid from some of the neighbouring tribes, and having divided their forces into three bands, each under a "king," proceeded to ravage the country in the Persian line of march, and retreat before the invading army, always keeping a day's march in advance, hoping so to weary them out. When Darius had been thus led about for several months, seeing that he was gaining nothing, he sent an envoy to the Scüthic camp to demand earth and water as tokens of submission. The reply of Idanthysus, the Scüthic leader, has a true Israelitish ring in it: "I never fear men, or fly from them. Earth and water, the

\* *Herodotus* IV. 93. They are naturally confused with the Thracians, as living on the Thracian side of the Danube. At a later period they will be found occupying Roumania on the north of that river.

tribute thou askest, I do not send, but thou shalt soon receive more suitable gifts. Last of all, in return for thy calling thyself my lord, I say to thee, Go weep." At the mention of slavery, the Scüths were filled with rage, and frequent combats ensued. "The Scüthic horse always put to flight the horse of the enemy," and the final conflict was disastrous for the Persians. A few years ago, in Galicia, the north-eastern province of Austria, and the western portion of ancient Scüthia, were discovered what are admitted by archæologists to be the crown jewels of Cyrus the Great. These must have been captured from Darius on the occasion of this expedition, from which he retired defeated, and went back with all haste to his Asiatic dominions. Thus was Israel "the Lord's Battle-axe" against the Persians—the second of Daniel's World-Empires.

These events occupied parts of the years 508, 507. Herodotus tells us that "according to the account which the Scüths themselves give, they are the youngest of all nations. They add that from the time of Tar-gitaus,\* their first king, to the invasion of their country by Darius, is a *period of 1000 years, neither less nor more.*"† This would bring us to about 1500 B.C., the time of the first national leader of the Israelites, Moses; while the tradition that Tar-gitaus was the son of a god and of the daughter of one of the Scüthic rivers, may point to the familiar story of Moses in the bulrushes of the river of Egypt.

In 490 B.C. Idanthysus was succeeded in the command of the Scüthic army by Ariapithes, who, in 460, was followed by Skylas. The Scüths, discontented with the latter, chose another leader, Octamasadas; and it was soon after this, in about 450, that Herodotus, the Greek historian, visited Scüthia. He has left us a detailed account of all the circumstances of Scüthic life; in other words, we have *lost Israel, 270 years after their captivity, described by an eye-witness.* As he devoted nearly the whole of one of his nine books to this account, it becomes very difficult to condense what he says. His information may be divided as follows:—

#### I. GEOGRAPHY OF SCÜTHIA.

The country inhabited by the Scüths was roughly a square, 500 miles every way, giving an area of 250,000 square miles. This description fits in perfectly with the geographical features, as shown in a Physical Atlas. The S. boundary was the Black Sea coast from

\* This name may contain the same form as Getai, Sagetai.

† IV. 5—7.

the Danube to the Don ; the whole course of the Don formed the E. boundary, the N.E. corner being close to the modern Moscow ; the N. side was bounded by a low range of hills, parallel to the coast of the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea, and extending nearly to the Baltic ; the W. boundary being formed by the upper waters of the Vistula, by the Carpathian mountains, and the lower course of the river Sereth, to its mouth in the Danube. The country answering to this tract in modern times is the richest part of the Russian Empire. It includes part of Great Russia, the whole of Poland, South Russia, Moldavia, Bessarabia, and the Crimea. Herodotus mentions the Tribes into which the Scüthic nation was divided—the Royal Tribe and five others; the former being the “largest and bravest, and looking down upon all the other tribes in the light of slaves.” In this there seems something of the spirit of Ephraim ; but the Royal Tribe may have included other Tribes of Israel: Prof. Rawlinson thinks that there may have been at all times *three* great tribes among the Royal Scüths. On this supposition there were *eight tribes of Scüths*. Now (Dan and Simeon having escaped) *eight tribes of Israelites* had been originally carried captive. It will be shown later that *eight tribes of Saxons* entered Britain. May this not be something more than a mere coincidence?

The climate, as described by Herodotus, was well adapted to fit them for their future permanent sojourn in the cold regions of the north-west. “During eight months the frost is intense. The sea freezes, and the Kimmerian Bosphorus is frozen over. Even in the remaining four months the climate is still cool. In summer it never ceases raining.” Even at the present day S. Russia has winter for six months ; the great rivers are frozen over, and the sea freezes to a considerable distance from the shore. The rigour of the climate, however, was compensated for by many advantages. The central river of Scüthia, the Dniepr, had “upon its banks the loveliest and most excellent pasturages for cattle ; it contains abundance of the most delicious fish ; its water is most pleasant to the taste ; its stream is limpid ; the richest harvests spring up along its course, and, where the ground is not sown, the heaviest crops of grass.” But before all was the extensive “woodland,” the remains of which are described in most striking language by a modern traveller.\* “In the vicinity of the great rivers,” she says, “the country assumes a different aspect, and the wearied eye at last enjoys the pleasure of

\* Madame de Hell, quoted in Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. iii.



encountering more limited horizons and more verdant vegetation, and a landscape more varied in its outlines. Among these rivers the Dniepr claims one of the foremost places. After having spread out to the breadth of nearly a league, it parts into a multitude of channels that wind through forests of oaks, alders, poplars, and aspens, whose vigorous growth bespeaks the richness of a virgin soil. The groups of islands, capriciously breaking the surface of the waters, have a melancholy beauty and a primitive character scarcely to be seen, except in those vast wildernesses where man has left no traces of his presence. Nothing in our country\* at all resembles this land of landscape. These *plavniks* of the Dniepr, seldom touched by the woodman's axe, *have all the wild majesty of the forests of the New World.*" Truly GOD was loving unto Israel.

## 2. LANGUAGE.

Herodotus has handed down a small Scüthic vocabulary, which exhibits the Scüths neither as Medes, Goths, nor Kelts, *but has points of resemblance to the speech of all these nations*, as will be seen from the following specimens.†

SCÜTHIC.	ZEND, SANSKRIT, &C.	GOOTHIC, ENGLISH, AND KELTIC.
<i>oior</i> , "man."	<i>vīra, vairya, ariya vair</i> (G)	
	(old Persian)	<i>gwr</i> (K)
<i>pata</i> , "to kill."	<i>vadha</i>	<i>beat, batter.</i>
<i>spu</i> , "eye."		<i>spy.</i>
<i>-inda</i> , "sea."		<i>ende</i> (A-Saxon).
		<i>sirende</i> "on the sea."
<i>kasus</i> "white"	<i>kas</i>	<i>kausch</i> (German).
<i>Tabiti</i> , "fire-goddess"	<i>tap</i> "to burn"	
<i>Oitosyrus</i> , "sun-god."		
<i>syrus</i>	<i>sārya</i> "sun."	
<i>oito-</i>		<i>white.</i>
<i>Thami-masadas.</i>		
"Water-god."		
<i>Thami</i>		<i>Thames, Tamar.</i>
<i>-masadas</i>	<i>mazda</i> "great."	
<i>Spargapithes</i>	<i>Svarga pati</i>	
	"lord of heaven."	
<i>Ariapithes</i>	<i>Ariya</i> "manly,"	
	"noble"	
<i>Anach-arsis.</i>		
<i>Anach</i>	<i>naga</i> (Persian).	
<i>-arsis</i>	<i>arsha</i> , "venerable."	

\* ? France.

† The corresponding words are given on the authority of Dr. Donaldson, and Professor Rawlinson.

*Kar-kinitis* (a Scüthic town).

*Is-ter*, "river-water."  
(the Danube.)

*Is*  
*Porata* (Pruth).

*Hypan-is* (Boug)

*Tiarant-us*,

*Danas-per* (Dniepr)

*Danas-ter* (Dniester)

*Dan-ube*

*Tan-a-is* (*Don*)

*Kaer* (*Kaer-leon*, &c.)

*Isis*, *Tham-isis*.

*Furth* (Germ.).

*Ford*, river *Forth*.

*Apan*, *Avon*.

River *Trent*.

} generally referred to a supposed root meaning "water"; may not improbably contain the Hebrew word seen in *Jor-dan*.

As regards *Is*, Prof. Rawlinson remarks, "We may trace this element in the names of rivers *from the vicinity of the Euphrates to the banks of the Thames*." He also says:—"It is interesting to observe in these names the Keltic river names, *Avon*, *Don*, *Trent*, and *Forth*." The evidence of language, then, so far as available or permissible, traces the Scüths from Media to Britain.

### 3.—NATIONAL CHARACTER.

"The Black Sea has nations dwelling round it, *with the one exception of the Scüths*, more unpolished than those of any other region that we know of."\* So Æschylus speaks of the "Scüths ruled by *good laws*." Another Greek historian says: "In respect of military strength and number of soldiers, *no single nation, either in Europe or Asia, could match the Scüths*."† Herodotus adds:—"They have, in one respect, and that the very most important of all that fell under man's control, shown themselves wiser than any other nation upon the face of the earth. Possessing no houses but waggons, and carrying these about wherever they go, how can they fail of being *unconquerable*, and even *unassailable*?" Such was the early growth of the "Fifth, last, and unconquerable Empire."

### 4.—MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

Of the Scüthic customs described by Herodotus, some point to contact with Mongolian races during their sojourn in Asia, some to a residence in Media, some are of a plainly Israelitish origin. They had an extreme hatred of all foreign customs—as a nation whose destiny it was to "live alone;" their religion appeared to be a worship of the elements; they made booths, like the Israelites; they had fables of griffins, the representations of which on the

\* Hdt. iv. 46.

† Thuc. ii. 97, about 420 B.C.

Scüthic tombs are almost exactly like the winged lions of the Assyrians; their oaths were accompanied by ceremonies identical with those of the Medes; they used skulls as drinking cups, as did the Northmen of later years; their weapons were the spear, the *battle-axe*, but above all, the *bow*. Describing their sacrifices, Herodotus says: "After flaying the beasts, they take out all the bones, and put the flesh into boilers or cauldrons of a large size, *then placing the bones of the animals beneath the cauldron, they set them alight, and so boil the meat.*" In a passage of Ezekiel we read: "take the choice of the flock, and *burn also the bones under it, and make it boil well.*"\* Prof. Rawlinson thinks both these passages refer to the same custom. In Hosea we find these words: "My people ask counsel of their stocks, *and their staff declareth unto them.*"† Let us mark the words of Herodotus: "Skythia has an abundance of Soothsayers who *foretell the future by means of a number of willow wands.* A large bundle of these wands is brought and laid on the ground. The Soothsayer unties the bundle, and places each wand by itself, at the same time uttering his prophecy."‡ Finally, in sacrifices "*they never use swine; nor, indeed, is it their wont to breed them in any part of their country.*"§ Such is the testimony of the Greek historian.

Subsequent to the time of Herodotus, there are but scanty allusions to Scüthia and the Scüths. The few facts known seem to be briefly these. About B.C. 438, the Scüths extended their dominion to the eastern side of the Kimmerian Bosphorus, or Straits of Yenikaleh. This territory they continued to hold till 304. From 393 to 353 B.C., the Scüthic corn-trade rose to an unprecedented height. The ordinary annual trade with Athens was 600,000 bushels, and on one occasion as much as 3,150,000 bushels were shipped for the same place from one port in the Crimea. During the reign of Philip of Macedon, or about 350 B.C., the Getae, noticed previously as the southern vanguard of Scüthic Israel, retired to the north of the Danube, where they are found later, under the name of Dacians, occupying the Danubian Principalities and the neighbouring portion of Hungary. The geographer Strabo, like Herodotus, points out "that the care of worshipping the Supreme Being is great among this nation, is not to be doubted, after what Posidonius has related, '*and they even abstain from animal food from religious motives,*' as likewise on account of the testimony of other historians."|| The same authority frequently praises Scüths, Getae, Dacians, for the open

\* xxiv. 5.    † iv. 12.    ‡ Hdt. iv. 67.    § Hdt. iv. 63.    || vii. 3. § 4.

sincerity of their conduct. He also narrates some additional facts in their history. "Dromichaetes, who was king of the Getae in the times of the successors of Alexander, having taken captive Lysimachus, who had come to wage war against him, showed him his poverty and that of his people, and likewise their great frugality, bade him not to make war on such, but rather seek them as friends; after which he received him as a guest; made a treaty of friendship, and suffered him to depart."\* At a later period we are told, "Boerebistas, one of the Getae, having taken the command of his tribe, reanimated the men who were disheartened by frequent wars, and raised them to such a degree of training, sobriety, and a habit of obedience to orders, that he established a powerful dominion within a few years, and brought most of the neighbouring states into subjection to the Getae. He at length became formidable even to the Romans, fearlessly crossing the Danube, and *laying waste* Thrace as far as Macedonia and Illyria; he also subdued the Kelts who live among the Thracians and Illyrians, and thoroughly *annihilated* the Boii and Taurisci."†

Herodotus mentions a nation called *Sauro-matai* as dwelling on the borders of Scüthia, east of the river Don in its lower course. The name appears in later times as *Sar-matae*, and is said to mean, "Northern *Medes*." I believe that *Assyrians*, as well as *Medes*, were included under this appellation. I will show the bearing of this more clearly in a subsequent chapter.

About 250 B.C., there was an immigration into Scüthia of some "Kelts" from Galatia, who have been traced in Part I. as Israelites of the tribes which escaped the captivity; these immigrants becoming absorbed amongst the main mass of the Scüthic nation. Finally we have a notice of the Scüths as still occupying part of the Scüthia of Herodotus, about the year 115 B.C., in connection with the early aggressive movements of Mithridates of Pontus. The succeeding two centuries present us with material in the history of the Dacians; and we shall find that, while considerable offshoots from the Scüths penetrated, some by land, some by sea, to North Western Germany and Scandinavia, at an earlier period than the rest, yet *the main mass of the nation still retained, for a while, their settlements near the Carpathian Mountains and the Black Sea—the region of Ar-sareth.*

\* vii. 3. § 9.

† Ib. § 11.







## CHAPTER X.

### FIRST MIGRATION WEST—THE KIMBRI.

*The Getae in Roumania—B.C. 113—The Kimbri—The name identical with that of the Kimmerians—Advance up the Danube and the Drave—Battle of Noreia—The Kimbri pass through Switzerland—Battles in S. Gaul—Battles of Arausio—Three great victories almost in one day—The Kimbri S. of the Pyrenees—They ravage Gaul—Combine with the Teutones to invade Italy—Battle on the Adige—Marius. B.C. 114 to 100.*



AT this point I would ask the reader to refer to a good map of Europe, keeping in his mind the concluding sentences of the preceding chapter. He will see that the territory occupied by the Scüthic Getae after B.C. 350, extended a considerable distance along the northern bank of the Danube, towards Illyria and North Italy. It was mentioned as probable that the mass of the Scüthic nation remained nearly in the region described by Herodotus until after the commencement of the Christian æra; but at the same time that there were considerable off-shoots into the country to the west. One of these off-shoots I am now about to present for consideration, as seen in a movement which some authorities consider to have been caused by the commencement of the aggressive wars of Mithridates.

In the year 113 B.C. the generals and armies of the Poman Republic were surprised by a sudden onslaught of an irresistible foe. The name of these "barbarians" has been handed down by Roman historians as *Cimbri* (pronounced Kimbri). Who were these? This question ought not to be difficult to answer. The following is the testimony of Prof. Rawlinson. "The identity of the *Cymry* of Wæles with the *Cimbri* of the Romans seems worthy of being accepted as an historical fact. The historical connection of the latter with the *Cimmerii* of Herodotus, has strong probabilities."\* Plutarch, one of the later Greek historians, refers to some "barbarians, originally called

\* Translation of Herodotus, III.

Kimmerii, but afterwards Kimbri." Posidonius, another ancient authority, states that "the Greeks called the Kimbri Kimmerii;" and Mr. Long says: "the Roman word Cimbri is a correct verbal equivalent for the Greek word Cimmerii."\* A moment's reflection will show that the groundwork of all these forms is Kimri, which is identical with Kymry, and also with the Israelite name Beth-Khumri.

Of modern authorities, some regard the Kimbri as Kelts, others as Germans, a natural difficulty to those ignorant of the association of Israel with both. As regards the country from which they came, authorities, ancient and modern, are divided between Northern and Eastern Europe. The Northern hypothesis rests on the Kimbri occupying part of Denmark, about the beginning of the Christian æra, but they will be seen to be merely the descendants of the Kimbri of a century antecedent; and it is improbable that a migrating people should return to the place from which they started. The Eastern hypothesis, however, accounts at once for their name, and for the place of their first contact with the Romans—the country at the head of the Adriatic Sea. This is well put by the learned historian Heeren. "The *Kimbri* or *Kimmerians*, probably a nation of German origin, from beyond the Black Sea, originated a popular migration, which extended from thence as far as Spain. Their march was, perhaps, occasioned or accelerated by the Skythian War of Mithridates; and *their course*, like that of most nomad races, *was from East to West along the Danube*."† These considerations clear the way for a detailed and almost certain account of the fortunes of this band of Israelites up to the time which saw them settled in the country which was, at a later period, reached by the main body of their brethren.

Leaving their homes in Roumania, about some time probably the year 114 B.C., they first advanced westwards along the left bank of the river, through the southern portion of Hungary. Mommsen, in his *History of Rome*, has given us a picture of their march.‡ "It was a marvellous movement, the like of which the Romans had never seen. A migratory people had set out with their women and children, with their goods and chattels, to seek a new home. *The waggon§ . . . was among the Cimbrians as it were their house*, where, beneath the leather covering stretched over it, a place was

\* Roman Republic ii. 46.

† *Manual of Ancient History*, p. 370.

‡ Book IV., ch. 5.

§ Cf. this same characteristic applied by Herodotus to the Scüths.



found for the wife and children, and even for the house-dog, as well as for the furniture. The men of the south beheld with astonishment those tall, lank figures with the *fair locks and bright blue eyes* . . . Thus marched the Cimbri into the unknown land . . . carrying their lumbering waggon-castle, with the dexterity which a long migratory life imparts, over streams and mountains, dangerous to more civilized nations, like the wave and the hurricane. They came and struck like lightning; like lightning they vanished."

It was not until they had penetrated nearly to the source of one of the tributaries of the Danube, the Drave, that they came into contact with the power of Rome. In B.C. 113 the name of the Kimbri was first heard at Rome, and the tranquillity of Italy, as Mr. Long narrates, was disturbed by the news of *an enemy more formidable than any which the Romans had yet known*. At Noreia, in Northern Illyricum, the modern Austrian province of Carinthia, and sixty miles north of the head of the Adriatic Sea, almost on the confines of Italy, the first conflict took place. The Roman Consul, Cn. Papirius Carbo, occupied the passes of the Carnic or Julian Alps, but the Kimbri did not attack. Carbo accordingly crossed the mountains; the Kimbri sent envoys, whom he sent back with guides to conduct them to their camp; he had really given the guides orders to lead them by a circuitous route, while he hurried on by a shorter cut, and fell on the enemy, who were unprepared for an attack. But they resisted boldly, and at length the betrayed defeated the betrayer. Carbo lost many of his men; he would have lost his whole army, but for a sudden thunderstorm, which shrouded the heavens in darkness, and separated the opposing forces. The Roman army was routed and dispersed. *That storm, says Mommsen, alone prevented the complete annihilation of the Roman army*. The Kimbri might have immediately advanced on Rome; but as with the "Gauls" after the battle of the Allia, B.C. 390, they were held back. The Fourth Empire was not yet ripe for its final doom.

Three years elapse before we hear of the Kimbri again. At some point during that time they must have passed through Switzerland into France, gathering allies as they went. Amongst the latter were the Teutones, who according to one account were with them from the first, and who, in that case, would be certainly a band of those Assyrians\* who had sojourned side by side with the Israelites on the Black Sea. In 109 B.C., the Kimbri appeared in the Roman territory in Southern Gaul, and requested the Romans to assign them land where

\* The Sauro-matai. *Vide supra*, p. 76.

they might settle peacefully ; but this request was contemptuously rejected, and the Roman General, M. Junius Silanus, attacked them. *He was utterly defeated, and the Roman camp was taken.* Thus a second time had the *remnant of Jacob gone through, trodden down, and torn in pieces, and there was none to deliver* ; but again they were kept back from following up their victory. The following year they spent in ravaging and subduing the Gallic and Helvetic cantons ; and in B.C. 107, aided by their allies, they won a third decisive victory, over L. Cassius Longinus. *The general and the greater portion of the soldiers met their death* ; the remnant had to pass under the yoke to escape destruction. So cowed were the Romans by this defeat, that some of their Gallic subjects took the opportunity to rise against them and place their garrison in chains ; but a third time the Kimbri were content with victory.

The next year was employed by both sides in husbanding their strength, and in B.C. 105 the Kimbri took up a position on the lower Rhone, seriously meditating an inroad into Italy. The Roman forces seem to have been divided into two separate armies. Livy\* tells how the one, under M. Aurelius Scaurus, was *totally defeated*, and the general himself brought as a prisoner to the enemy's head-quarters. He told them not to cross the Alps into Italy as they would find the Romans invincible, and a Kimbrian chieftain, Boiorix, indignant at this haughty warning, put him to death. The second Roman army was stationed at Arausio, situated on the left bank of the Rhone in modern Provence ; but the commanders, Q. Servius Cæpio and Cn. Manlius Maximus, could not agree amongst themselves. The consequence of this was the greatest disaster the Romans had yet suffered. The account in Mommsen is worth giving entire† :—" In vain deputies from the Roman Senate endeavoured to effect a reconciliation ; a personal conference between the generals, on which the officers insisted, only widened the breach. When Cæpio saw Maximus negotiating with the envoys of the Kimbrians, he fancied that the latter wished to gain the sole credit of their subjugation, and threw himself with his portion of the army alone in all haste on the enemy, on the 6th of October, B.C. 105. *He was utterly annihilated, so that even his camp fell into the hands of the enemy ; and his destruction was followed by the no less complete defeat of the second Roman army.* It is asserted that 80,000 Roman soldiers, and half as many of the immense and helpless body of camp-followers, perished, and that *only ten men escaped* : this much is certain, that only a few out of the two armies

\* Epitome, 77.

† Book IV., ch. 5.

succeeded in escaping, for the Romans had fought with the river in their rear. *It was a calamity which materially and morally far surpassed the day of Cannæ.* The battle of Arausio, the alarming proximity of the victorious Kimbrian army to the undefended passes of the Alps, produced a sudden and fearful awakening. Men recalled the never wholly forgotten Keltic inroads of the fourth century, the day on the Allia and the burning of Rome; through all the west people seemed to be aware that the *Roman empire was beginning to totter.*" Three such victories almost in one day! Could anything be a more complete comment on Micah's prophecy of the Remnant of Jacob, like a lion, "*who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver*"? Have we not heard of a "Stone, cut out of the mountain without hands," which was to grow during Four World-Empires, and to break in pieces "all these kingdoms"? And what but a special Providence prevented the victorious army from marching to the subjection of Rome itself?

"It is impossible to tell," says Mommsen, "what might have happened had the Kimbrians, immediately after the double victory, advanced through the gates of the Alps into Italy." Instead, they *devastated* all the country between the Rhone and the Pyrenees, and some even crossed into Spain. A glance at the map will show that this was the wrong direction for them to make any permanent advance, rendering it less likely that they would ever rejoin the main mass of the Tribes of Israel; so that we can hardly be surprised to find them forced to retrace their steps into Gaul. They now appear to have made a tour of conquest through the greater part of Gaul, advancing along the shores of the Bay of Biscay. "*Everything from the Pyrenees to the Seine submitted to the terrible invaders*"\*

The Belgæ alone successfully resisted the conquerors of so many Roman armies. *These Belgæ we have already seen to be Israelites of the "Remnant that escaped";* and herein we have a striking undesigned coincidence to the truth of our attempted recovery of lost history. Thus definitely stopped in the north of France, the Kimbri plunged into the heart of the country. The Keltic Canaanites *fled into their towns to escape from the invaders, and many of them were reduced by a long blockade to the greatest extremities.* The Kimbri *ravaged the country, and leaving a waste behind them,* once more, in 103 B.C., approached the Roman territories in South-Eastern Gaul.

\* Mommsen.

At length the Romans had chosen a commander-in-chief who was destined to deliver them. This was C. Marius, who, by a proceeding unparalleled in the annals of the Republic, and in fact absolutely incompatible with the spirit of the free constitution of Rome, was elected to the highest office of the state for five years in succession. So great was their sense of the danger which beset them. *This exceptional power of one man was the germ of the future autocratic rule of the Emperors.*

In 103 B.C. the Kimbrian leaders resolved to attack Italy in earnest, and formed a detailed plan of action. The Kimbrians themselves, with some of their allies, were to descend through the passes of the Eastern Alps. The Teutones, who now appear on the scene again, were to move through Roman Gaul and the Western Alps. Their career, however, was rapidly brought to an end. The Roman general, Marius, had been completing and strengthening his army for two years, and the result was that he completely routed this division of the enemy. Meanwhile, the Kimbri had advanced through Switzerland up the Rhone valley,\* crossed the Alps by the Brenner Pass, in Tyrol, and descended through the valley of the Adige into the plains of Venetia. The events of this campaign (102 B.C.) are thus narrated by Mommsen:—"Here the consul, Q. Lutatius Catulus, was to guard the passes; but not fully acquainted with the country, and afraid of having his flank turned, he had not ventured to advance into the Alps, but had posted himself below Trent on the left bank of the Adige, and had secured in any event his retreat to the right bank by the construction of a bridge. When the Kimbrians, however, pushed forward in dense masses from the mountains, *a panic seized the Roman army*, and legionaries and horsemen ran off, the latter straight for the capital, the former to the nearest height which seemed to yield security. Catulus was obliged to withdraw to the right bank of the Po, and leave the whole plain between the Po and the Alps in the power of the Kimbri. Had the Kimbri continued their attack without interruption, Rome might have been greatly embarrassed." This repulse, in the summer of 102 B.C., was the seventh and last of the Kimbrian successes; and for the last time they allowed Rome to escape.

The spring of 101 B.C. came, and the Roman "deliverer" was at hand. Fifty thousand Roman troops, under Marius and Catulus, crossed the Po, and marched against the Kimbri. On the 30th of

\* Mommsen.

July the two armies met. The Kimbrians were surprised. Marius gained a complete victory with slight loss, and the conquering career of the Kimbri was once and for all ended. A small remnant alone escaped that fatal day, and in time must have rejoined their allies, the Teutones—such, at least, of the latter as had survived the previous defeat. The first victory of Israel over Rome (B.C. 390) was separated by nearly 300 years from this second series. More than another century elapsed before the next occasion of contact; but we shall then see Israel far more signally victorious even than during these twelve years of military supremacy.

It is probable that the remnant of the Kimbri soon reached North-west Germany. Certainly a century later they are found there. Tacitus, the historian of the early Roman Empire, records their embassy from North Germany to Augustus, praying for pardon for their victories over Rome at the close of the second century B.C. He describes them as "fewer in number, but of great reputation." The Peninsula of Denmark, from the presence there of the Kimbri, was called by the later Romans the Kimbric Chersonese. The modern name is *Jüt-land*, and it was probably these same Kimbri who entered Britain as *Jutes* (a form of the name *Goth*); but that will be considered in its proper place.

The effect on Rome of the war with the Kimbri was lasting. The deliverer, Marius, became for a time supreme. From this power there was but one step to the succeeding tyranny of Sulla; thence one step to the perpetual dictatorship of Julius Cæsar; thence one step to the imperial autocracy of Augustus, which led to the fall of the Fourth Empire.





## CHAPTER XI.

### SECOND MIGRATION WEST—ARMINIUS.

*Scüthai and Guthai, S'coth and Goth—the Cherusci—Later a part of the Saxons—Arminius—Defeat of Varus in the Battle of the Saltus Teutobergiensis—the Khatti—Hessians, or Hittites—Germanicus—Death of Arminius—First mention of the name "Saxons"—German religion—Who were the Goths?—Dan and the Danes—Assyrians and Medes. B.C. 100 to A.D. 150.*



WHEN the Romans first became practically acquainted with the country beyond the Danube and the Rhine—the great central plain of Europe, corresponding to the modern Germany—one of the ethnic names they met with was that of *Guthai* or *Goths*. This tract of country was the immediate western neighbour of Scüthia at the time of its largest extent in 450 B.C.; and the Vistula, which is the Eastern river of the German plain, rises in close proximity to the source of the Scüthic river Ar-arus or Sereth. *Mas-sagétai, Thys-sagétai, Sagétai, Gauthai, Gétai*, are names all occurring in connection with the Scüths, and exhibiting different forms of one original name, derived from the Hebrew *S'coth*, and denoting "Wanderers among the Nations." In this way, may not *Scüthai* and *Guthai, S'coth* and *Goth* be identical? Many of the learned have so regarded these names. Some few have supposed that the Scüths entirely disappeared, but the account of their national character in Herodotus alone renders that supposition in the highest degree improbable; and from our present point of view, if the Scüths were the Lost Tribes, the plain requirements of prophecy forbid us to suppose that they were either lost or absorbed. Supposing, therefore, a portion to have left their homes between the Black Sea and the Baltic, the physical features of the country, the lie of mountain chains, &c., make the advance westward the only natural course to follow; and a trace of such an

advance is contained in the name "Goth." Whether the "Goths," as first known to the Romans, were the same as those who, several centuries later, played so prominent a part in the breaking-up of the Roman Empire, and whether those later "Goths" were Israelites, are questions which will be considered afterwards. As the Israelitish name "Scüth" became a general appellation with geographers for the inhabitants of Northern Europe and Asia; as the name "Sarmatian" had a similarly extended application; so it may be that the later "Goths" adopted their name from the warlike nation to which it originally belonged. For the present, I will pass to surer ground, and narrate a series of events which I believe are to be assigned to a second migration of Scüthic Israel into the plains of Western Germany. The first migration started south of the Carpathian Mountains; the present one on the northern side of that range.

At the dawn of the Christian æra, the heart of Germany, the district between the upper waters of the rivers Weser and Elbe, corresponding to the Saxon provinces of the modern German Empire, was occupied by a people whose name has been handed down in the Latin form, Cherusci. *These were a portion of the ancestors of the Saxons of a later age.* The proofs of this point are given by Sir E. Creasy\* and Dr. Latham,† and seem conclusive. That they should not be called Saxons may seem an objection, but it must be remembered that the name Sakai, a certainly earlier form of Saxons, does not appear, prominently at least, among the appellations of the historic Scüths in Europe; and especially that our only sources of information about the various names of the Lost Tribes were casual occasions of contact with the outer world. This much is certain, that the late name "Saxones" seems to absorb the earlier "Cherusci." *"As long as we have the Cherusci, there are no Saxons. As soon as we meet with the Saxons, the Cherusci disappear."*

In the opening years of the first century A.D., the victorious arms of the early Roman Empire were carried across the Rhine into Germany. Arminius, or Hermann, the military chieftain of the Cherusci, and his nation of warriors, alone offered effectual resistance. The neighbouring country was kept down by Roman garrisons, and the German tribes submitted after a short struggle. Even the brother of the Cheruscan prince joined the victors. But Arminius, as we are told by Sir E. Creasy, "aspired to, and obtained from,

\* *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*, p. 126.

† *The Germany of Tacitus*, p. 130.

Roman enmity a higher title than could have been given him by Roman favour. It is in the pages of Rome's greatest historian that his name has come down to us with the proud addition of *Liberator haud dubie Germania*." Fired by beholding the contrast between the debased Italians and his own brave and manly countrymen, with their domestic virtues, "*their love of their national free institutions, and their loathing of every pollution and meanness,*" he resolved to resist to the last. The result "has for us this special attraction, that it forms part of our national history," and places Arminius in the foremost ranks of Israel's heroes.

It was the year A.D. 9, when the Roman commander, Quintilius Varus, led an army of three legions against the Cherusci. A wooded ridge of hills, intervening between the head-waters of the rivers Ems and Weser, and called the Saltus Teutobergensis, marked the scene of the encounter. This battle has been narrated by Sir E. Creasy as *one of the decisive battles of the world*, and his description may well be given at length. Let us picture to ourselves the Roman soldiers defiling through the thick mountain wood. "The crowd and confusion of the columns embarrassed the working parties of the soldiery, and in the midst of their toil and disorder the word was suddenly passed through their ranks that the rear guard was attacked by the barbarians. Varus resolved on pressing forward, but a heavy discharge of missiles from the woods on either flank taught him how serious was the peril, and he saw the best men falling round him without the opportunity of retaliation." In this way the first day of the engagement passed, and the second day came on. "Arminius now gave the signal for a general attack. The fierce shouts of the Germans pealed through the gloom of the forests, and in thronging multitudes they assailed the flanks of the invaders, pouring in clouds of darts on the encumbered legionaries, as they struggled up the glens or floundered in the morasses, and watching every opportunity of charging through the intervals of the disjointed column, and so cutting off communication between its brigades. Retreat was now as impracticable as advance. Unable to keep together, or force their way across the woods and swamps, *the horsemen were overpowered in detail and slaughtered to the last man.* Varus committed suicide. One of the lieutenant-generals of the army fell fighting; the other surrendered to the enemy. . . . The bulk of the Roman army fought steadily and stubbornly, frequently repelling the masses of the assailants, but gradually losing the compactness of their array, and becoming weaker and weaker beneath the incessant shower of darts



and the reiterated assaults of the vigorous and unencumbered Germans. At last, in a series of desperate attacks, *the column was pierced through and through, two of the eagles captured, and the Roman host*, which on the yester morning had marched forth in such pride and might, now broken up into confused fragments, *either fell fighting beneath the overpowering numbers of the enemy, or perished in the swamps in unavailing efforts at flight.* Few, very few, ever saw again the left bank of the Rhine. One body of brave veterans, arraying themselves in a ring on a little mound, beat off every charge of the Germans, and prolonged their honourable resistance to the close of that dreadful day. The traces of a feeble attempt at forming a ditch and mound attested in after years the spot where the last of the Romans passed their night of suffering and despair. But on the morrow this remnant also, worn out with hunger, wounds, and toil, was charged by the victorious Germans, and either massacred on the spot, or offered up in fearful rites at the altars of the deities of the old mythology of the North. *Never was victory more decisive, never was the liberation of an oppressed people more instantaneous and complete.* Throughout Germany the Roman garrisons were assailed and cut off; and within a few weeks after Varus had fallen, the German soil was freed from the foot of an invader. At Rome the tidings of the battle was received with an agony of terror, the descriptions of which we should deem exaggerated, did they not come from Roman historians themselves. *The chief alarm of Augustus was, that he expected them to push on against Italy and Rome;* he often beat his head against the wall, and exclaimed, 'Quintilius Varus, give me back my legions.' *The blow which Arminius had struck never was forgotten.*" How truly decisive this victory was as regards the future history of the world—that is to say, how plainly we are here able to see Jehovah working out the accomplishment of His designs, is well put by the same authority in an earlier place. "Had Arminius been supine or unsuccessful, our Germanic ancestors would have been enslaved or exterminated in their original seats along the Eyder and the Elbe; this island would never have borne the name of England, and '*we, this great English nation, whose race and language are now overrunning the earth from one end of it to the other,*'\* would have been utterly cut off from existence."

Thus once more are we able to lift the veil which covers those dark ages of the world's history, and we see the *Remnant of Jacob*,

\* Arnold's Lectures on Modern History.

which Jehovah had promised should be a nation before Him for ever, again, with irresistible force and with lasting result, *treading down and tearing in pieces* the Roman or Fourth World-Empire. *There was none to deliver*; no Roman General ever avenged the destruction of the legions of Varus. But Israel's hand was stayed, and Israel's hosts were not permitted to advance to the annihilation of their enemy. The cup of Rome's iniquity was not yet full; its final doom was not yet; but though waiting, it was none the less sure. Whatever race it was which finally stepped into the territory which fell from the enfeebled grasp of Rome, the brunt of the breaking in pieces—first on the Allia, 390 B.C., next amidst the Alps 113 to 102 B.C., and now, A.D. 9, in the heart of Germany—was borne by Israel, *the Lord's battle-axe*.

The scene of the great battle still retains the name, Teutoberger Wald, which it bore in the days of Arminius; and on or near the spot occur such names as, "*das Winnefeld*" (the field of Victory), "*die Knochenbahn*" (the bone-lane), "*die Knochenleke*" (the bone-brook), and "*der Mordkessel*" (the field of slaughter); names which are living evidence of the effect of that signal victory. Other victories were won by the same chieftain over the same enemy, in the years immediately succeeding, but it was only of that won in the defiles of the Saltus Teutobergiensis that the memory remained.

The year A.D. 15 witnessed the first attempt to revenge the Roman disaster. A Roman army, led by a member of the Imperial house, Germanicus, advanced across the Rhine into Germany. The first tribe encountered were the Khatti.\* These agree in geographical position with the modern Hessians. Now, as "*water*" is the same as the German "*wasser*," so *Khatti and Hesse are identical names*. Indeed, at a very early period we find this people calling themselves *Het-wara*, or, People of *Het*. These names correspond exactly to those of a powerful nation bordering on ancient Israel, known to us as Hittites. *They called themselves children of Heth; the Assyrians called them Khatti*. The twofold similarity of name, and the vicinity of an Israelitish nation, irresistibly suggest the inference that these Khatti were the descendants of the ancient Hittites, who must have been equally with Israel exposed to the power of Assyria (indeed from their position between Israel and Assyria they must have been conquered first), and may easily have shared in their escape. This is a very strong *undesigned coincidence*.

\* I write this name "Khatti," not "Chatti," to show the true pronunciation.

Beyond the Khatti, however, Germanicus could not advance. Face to face with the Cherusci and Arminius, he found himself obliged to retire to the Rhine, and seek his desired vengeance by an indirect advance. Conveying his troops down the Rhine, then northwards along the coast of Holland, he disembarked them on the river Ems in Hanover. Thence he advanced by land to the neighbourhood of the scene of Varus's disaster, and here a battle was fought. The account of this is given in a note to Messrs. Church and Brodribb's Translation of the Annals of Tacitus.\* According to their own accounts, the Romans, previous to the battle, had "pursued Arminius as he retreated into trackless wilds." "But the advance evidently proved very dangerous; and though we are told that the legions struck terror into the enemy, only a very indecisive engagement was fought, in which indeed it may be presumed that the Romans were worsted. Germanicus, at all events, decided on an immediate retreat. The army was led back to the Ems, and conveyed down it by ships. One division was surrounded by the enemy in a most unfavourable position, and extricated itself only by the most desperate fighting. It suffered heavy loss, and was in a miserable plight after the battle." Sir E. Creasy adds, that Arminius "would have destroyed them completely had not his skilful system of operations been finally thwarted by a confederate German chief." Thus the campaign of A.D. 15 ended not only unsuccessfully for the Romans, but also disastrously.

In the following year a fresh attempt was made, with like result. In the plain of Idistavus, on the Weser, in Hanover, Germanicus and Arminius were again opposed. The Romans again claimed a victory, but Tacitus† adds that the cavalry engagement was indecisive. The evidence of that historian's translators is to the point: "Nothing is said of the submission or surrender of the Germans, or even of their flight. Germanicus, indeed, raised a trophy, commemorating the subjugation of all the tribes between the Rhine and the Elbe. This was a mere empty vaunt: only one tribe, the Angrivarii, submitted. . . . The Germans could not have been very decisively beaten, for they now instantly renewed hostilities. . . . It is perfectly clear that the net result of his campaigns was exceedingly insignificant. He conquered nothing; it cannot be said that he effectually intimidated the enemy. His victories, such as they were, were almost more than counterbalanced by his serious losses. The conquest of Germany to the Elbe was probably more than he could

\* p. 392.

† Annals ii. 21.

have ever accomplished. The idea of extending the Roman frontier to that river seems to have been finally abandoned. Henceforth the Rhine became a recognised boundary of Rome's Empire," and Israel in Germany was left to mature its strength for the final move into the Isles of the West.

"The Cherusci," Dr. Latham tells us, "withstood the aggressions of their own countrymen, as steadily as they did those of Rome." "Their own countrymen" means neighbouring "German," *i.e.*, Assyrian and kindred tribes. Maroboduus, the leader of a confederacy of these German tribes, was endeavouring to subject his neighbours, but Arminius was in arms against him. From A.D. 17 to 19, a desultory warfare was kept up. At last a pitched battle was fought, and Maroboduus confessed the ascendancy of his opponent by avoiding a renewal of the engagement, and by imploring aid from Rome. Shortly after this, Arminius was assassinated by some of his kinsmen, in the thirty-seventh year of his age, after a brilliant career as "elective war-chieftain" of Cheruscan-Israel. His fame lived long after him. Fitly named Hermann, the "war-man," or "man of hosts," the memory of his deeds survived in the Irmin-sul ("column of Hermann") of the old Saxons, and the Irmin-street of the early settlers of England.

The last mention of the name Cherusci is connected with the year A.D. 47, when Tacitus records that they sent to Rome for a descendant of Arminius to be their chieftain, all the other descendants apparently having died. The name disappears, and another gradually takes its place.

It may be that some would regard the evidence connecting the Cherusci with the later Saxons as insufficient, and yet admit the possibility of Arminius being an Israelitish chieftain, who had come with others over the Baltic Sea from the mouth of the Vistula to that of the Elbe. But however they came (and it is more likely that they came by sea, than across the closely-wooded lands of Germany), I am inclined to believe that among the Cherusci there was a considerable Israelitish element; that they were, so to speak, the advanced guard of Israel in Germany; and that the name of Saxons, *i.e.*, Sakasúnavas, sons of the Sakai, or Beth Isaak, only became widely known after the last and largest migration of Israelites had left Scúthia. The first mention of the name is by Ptolemy, not later than 141 A.D. Tacitus also mentions the Angli. But the Cherusci, Kimbri, Angli, and early Saxons are not sufficient to account for the whole Scúthic nation.

Before leaving the period marked by the name of Cherusci, it will be worth noticing some allusions to German customs mentioned in Tacitus, Germania, with a decidedly Israelitish bearing.\* "Augury by wands" will at once recall the Scüthic custom which we saw to be identical with a custom of Israel. The following quotation speaks for itself: "The deities of the Germans are *not confined within walls, nor fashioned into any mortal shapes; they hallow groves and woods,* and call by the name of gods that secrecy, the presence of which is felt by reverence alone." Immediately before the captivity, "Ephraim was joined to idols," but the guiding hand of Jehovah was gradually training "His firstborn" to a better way. Still idolatrous, but without the grosser features of idolatry, neither in Scüthia nor in Germany had they images. We have also seen that they had no kings; for "the children of Israel shall abide many days *without a king,* and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and *without an image,* and without an ephod, and without teraphim."†

At this point it will be best to consider the answer to the question, Who were the Gothic invaders of the Roman Empire? The truth is probably as follows:—The Scüths composing the migration, or series of small migrations, the occurrence of which has been assumed in this chapter, were accompanied by various Assyrian, Median, and kindred tribes, who had gradually collected on the borders of Scüthia. One section of the Israelite Scüths, or Goths, possibly the early naval adventurers of the Tribe of Dan,‡ with some of their subject allies, made its way across the Baltic Sea into the southern part of Sweden. This was a very natural move for a people even with the least love of enterprise, the distance across the water being short, and the Danish isles making the step still easier to take. Settled here, in Sweden, all alike were known as Goths. As often happens, the superiority of the real owners of the name caused its acceptance by their companions, who practically lost their own. After a time some circumstance occurred which induced these allies—Assyrians perhaps, or Medians, to recross the Baltic to the mouth of the Vistula. These were the Goths, who after A.D. 200, leaving the banks of the Vistula, pressed southwards to the shores of the Black Sea. The story current among themselves was that they had come from Scandinavia, that is to say, Sweden. It is also a striking fact that they do not appear so much under the simple name of


\* ix. 10.

† Hosea iii. 4.

‡ These Danites would be traced to the inland colony in the North of Palestine, which must have been carried captive with the neighbouring tribes.

Goths, but as *Gothones*, *Guthones*, *Ostrogoths*, or *Visigoths*—names bearing out the supposition that they had only been in contact with Israel, and were not Israel themselves. Moreover, the language of these Goths, while bearing striking resemblance in many points to that of the Anglo-Saxons, still has signal points of difference in essential particulars; so that the two languages do not appear as mother and daughter, or even as sister and sister, but as cousin and cousin. This again points to social contact. The points of difference are not those which mark the typical Assyrian or German tongue, but rather those which distinguish the Median or Lithuanian. The inference therefore is that the Goths were Median by race, therefore not Israelites. Their entrance into the Roman Empire was in the humiliating position of fugitives from the victorious Huns. Their subsequent successes were due partly to the genius of individual leaders, but mainly to the entire corruption of the Roman administration; and after a short enjoyment of power, they in their turn succumbed to fresh invaders, *and became absorbed by their conquerors*. This fact is conclusive against their Israelitish origin.

A few words of explanation are necessary as regards the use of the names Assyrian and Median. What is meant by the former is that the lineal descendants of the ancient Assyrians are found in the High Germans of to-day—the races occupying the Western half of the modern German Empire. Some few of these, as the Khatti or Hessians, are only Assyrianised. Their nationality and language are merged in that of their more numerous neighbours. The Medians, on the other hand, have been traced into Europe under the name of *Sauro-matai*, or *Sar-matians*. Of these the Lithuanians are the direct descendants. *The resemblance of the Lithuanian language to that of ancient Media is complete*. A large part of the so-called Slavs are tribes of kindred origin, whose language has become merged in that of the Medes. Others are Mongolian Tatars. *There is no such thing as a great Slavonic race*. These ethnological considerations may easily be the key to the different race-problems of Europe; but I can do no more than allude to them here, for to give the evidence in full would require a separate treatise.





## CHAPTER XII.

### THIRD MIGRATION WEST—ODIN.

*The later Scüthia—The Dakians—Irruption of the Scüths into Mæsia—Dekebal—Trajan—The Dakians retire to the country between the Carpathians and the Dniepr—Israelitish gravestones in the Crimea—Odin—An historical character—Anglo-Saxon genealogies—Odin's date—Odin a Scüth—Led a large mass of Scüths from Åsgard on the Dniepr into Western Germany—This movement pressed the Germans on to the Roman Empire—Odin in Saxony—In Sweden—Scüthia and Swithiod—Death of Odin. B.C. 10 to A.D. 260.*

**I**T remains to describe the latter days of Israel's occupation of the Scüthic territory by the Black Sea, after the nation had been diminished by the large offshoots already mentioned. The "Scüthia" of the commencement of the Christian æra was a slight advance westwards from the "Scüthia" of Herodotus. Then the Eastern boundary was the Tanais or Don; now it was the Borysthenes or Dniepr. As the Scüths advanced from the Don, the Sarmatian nations, noticed by Herodotus under the name of Sauro-matai as dwelling east of that river, crossed into the regions between the Don and the Dniepr. The German or Assyrian tribes had originally skirted the Eastern frontier of the Scüths, but as the latter lost their two offshoots, the Germans, and probably also some of the Sarmatians, passed round to the North of Scüthia into the central plains of Europe. The earlier "Scüthia" was a square between the Don on the East and the Carpathian Mountains on the West. The later "Scüthia" was an oblong between the Dniepr on the East and the Theiss, a tributary of the Danube, on the West; the centre of this district being that very Sereth which was in a previous chapter connected with the Arsareth of Esdras. How truly, then, if the Scüths, the Getae, and the Dakians were, as has been supposed, Israel of the Captivity, did the Lost Tribes abide in their first settlements in Europe "till the latter days."

The occupants of the western half of this new "Scüthia"—the portion, on both sides of the Carpathians, included between the Dniestr, the Danube, and the Theiss—became known to the Romans, on whose dominions they bordered, as *Dakians*.\* In B.C. 10 the first Roman expedition entered Dacia, but it retired defeated. From the writers of the reign of Augustus we gather that the Romans regarded the Dakians as a formidable race. They crossed the Danube, plundered the allies of Rome, and were with difficulty driven back into their own country by the Imperial generals. About A.D. 70, according to Josephus,† there was a bold attempt of the "Scüths" against the Romans. These were evidently the "Dakians" of other authors. They crossed the Danube into Mœsia, "after which, by their violence, and entirely unexpected assault, they slew a great many of the Romans that guarded the frontiers, and as the consular legate, Fonteius Agrippa, came to meet them and fought courageously against them, he was slain by them. They then overran all the region that had been subject to him, *tearing* and *rending* everything that fell in their way." Once more it required the talent of a great general to drive the Dakians back across the Danube. But it was only for a time, for after the lapse of only a few years, during the reign of Domitian, they again carried the terror of their arms south of the river. For four years, from A.D. 86 to 90, they carried on the war under their King Deke-bal. Domitian himself took part in five campaigns against them. His lieutenant, Fuscus, was, in the language of Roman satire, "devoured by the Dakian vultures," and "at least one Roman army was overwhelmed with a lamentable defeat."‡ Such, indeed, was the success attending the Dakian arms, that Domitian was at least reduced to accept peace on the condition of paying an annual tribute to the "barbarians," a disgrace peculiarly galling to the conquerors of the world. Thus it was that, for a century, these hardy Scüthic warriors were a constant source of terror to the Roman Empire.

The final destruction, however, of the Roman power was not the part assigned to Scüthic Israel. At different points they inflicted on the Fourth Empire blows which were the cause of its final collapse; but it was reserved for other nations to finish the work which Israel had begun, and to inherit Rome's lost provinces. For Israel

\* Here, again, the *k* shews the true pronunciation. *Deke-bal* means Lord of the Deke, or Daki. And what is the origin of *Dak-i*? Since the Hebrew letter *ts* of *I-tsahak* (*vide supra*, p. 58), changed sometimes into *s*, sometimes into *t*, may not *Daki* be possibly a form of the name which elsewhere appears as *Sakai*?

† Wars, VII., 4.

‡ Merivale.



was reserved a nobler work—the founding of a new and lasting empire in the isles of the Western Sea. To reach the shores of the German Ocean from those of the Euxine, they must pass to the north of the Carpathians and the contiguous mountain ranges running through the centre of Europe nearly to the Rhine. Now, up to A.D. 100, a portion of the Israelites in Dakia were on the inner, *i.e.*, the wrong, side of the Carpathian range. But immediately after that date a Roman Emperor was raised up of more than ordinary military ability. This was Trajan. Eager for the addition of fresh provinces to the Empire, and chafing at the disgraceful compact with the Dakians, he crossed the Danube A.D. 101. After four years' continual fighting, during which the Dakian warriors, although the time had come when Jehovah, in the working out of His designs, took away from them the power of "going through," contested every inch of territory, Trajan stormed the fortress of the Dakian King in the highlands of Transylvania, and proceeded to convert the country into a Roman province. This was A.D. 105. The result was that "*a large number of the inhabitants migrated to the banks of the Borysthenes, where they were known as Tyra-getæ.*"\* This historical fragment contains *the passage of Dakian-Israel from the inner to the outer side of the Carpathians.* For the next century the settlement of Israel comprised the country between the Dniepr and the Sereth, bounded on the west by the new Roman province of Dakia, on the north and east by different Sarmatian tribes.

But what if, amongst all these speculations as to the nation of Israel, long "joined to idols," there were direct evidence of the presence of individual Israelites who had preserved their religion and their identity in the very region which has come under our consideration? Yet such is the case. There are tombstones now in the Museum at St. Petersburg, which were discovered in the Crimea, and which leave no doubt on the subject. The dates on these stones come within the first century A.D., and the inscriptions are as follows:— "This is the tombstone of Buki, the son of Izchak, the priest. May his rest be in Eden at the time of the salvation of Israel. In the year 702 of the years of our exile." "Rabbi Moses Levi died in the year 726 of our exile." "Zadok the Levite, son of Moses, died 4000 *after the creation*,† 785 of our exile." Could there be a more striking coincidence than that afforded by the evidence of these three tomb-

\* *Student's Manual of Ancient Geography*, p. 680.

† The Karaite era of the creation, making that event B.C. 3911.

stones? In the early history of Israel in Scüthia, we saw that one section, known to the Greeks as Getae, had probably not yet lapsed into idolatry. It is now clear that, from the time of Israel's escape from Media down to the commencement of the Christian æra, God reserved unto Himself a few faithful ones to be His witnesses in the midst of their idolatrous brethren.

A century from the time of Trajan's conquests in Dakia still saw the main mass of Scüthic Israel dwelling in the land of "Arsareth." But the time of their departure was at hand, and their destined leader to the regions of the West had already been born. This was *Odin*. Most people suppose that Odin, or Woden, was merely the name by which the Saxons and Scandinavians denoted the Supreme Deity. But, whatever the origin of the name, it is certain that there was an historical character who was so called. Not only are there traditions concerning him, which it would be the height of absurdity to explain away as myths of natural phænomena; but there is other and still stronger evidence. This is best given in the words of Sharon Turner. The difficulty, he says, as to the date of Odin,\* "has arisen partly from the confusion in which, from their want of chronology, all the incidents of the North, anterior to the eighth century, are involved, and partly from the wild and discordant fictions of the scalds, who have clouded the history of Odin by their fantastic mythology. The same obscurity attends the heroes of all countries, who have been deified after death, and upon whose memory the poets have taken the trouble to scatter the weeds as well as the flowers of their fancy. *The human existence of Odin appears to me to be satisfactorily proved by two facts:* 1st. The founders of the Anglo-Saxon Octarchy deduced their descent from Odin by genealogies, in which the ancestors are distinctly mentioned up to him. These genealogies have the appearance of greater authenticity by not being the servile copies of each other: they exhibit to us different individuals in the successive stages of ancestry of each; and they claim different children of Odin as founders of the lines. These genealogies are also purely Anglo-Saxon. 2nd. The other circumstance is that the Northern chroniclers and scalds derive their heroes also from Odin by his different children. Snorre, in his *Ynglinga Saga*, gives a detailed history of Sweden regularly from him; and though the Northerns cannot be suspected of having borrowed their genealogies from the Anglo-

\* *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, I. 214; *note*.

Saxons, yet they agree in some of the children ascribed to Odin. This coincidence between the genealogies preserved in their new country of men who left the North in the fifth and sixth centuries, and the genealogies of the most celebrated heroes who acted in the North during the subsequent ages, could not have arisen if there never had been an Odin who left such children." Another authority supplies more evidence. "Whatever was the period in which he flourished, Woden is in truth an historical personage. As such he was regarded by all our early chroniclers; the author of the *History of the Britons*, without a hint as to his divinity, gives him a line of ancestors; in the eighth century Beda says of him, 'from whose stock the royal races of many provinces derived their origin;' in the tenth, Asser simply mentions him as one of the line of his patron's ancestors." \* The historical value of the Anglo-Saxon genealogies is well pointed out by the same authority.† "The genealogies of the Teutonic royal dynasties are substantially genuine historic documents. That they ascend much higher than the annals, and even than the distinct traditions of our forefathers, is no more than might be expected; for (like the title-deeds of an estate), records, by which the succession to the throne would sometimes be determined on the failure of elder lives, would be preserved, even when others were allowed to perish, because the interests of the events they related was eclipsed by that of succeeding events. Now if, on examining the genealogies as they have been handed down to us, we find them to be intrinsically probable, and consistent, not only with one another, but with history, in the later portion which comprises twenty-five generations, we shall more readily acquiesce in the statement which presents to us the first nine, although we are unable to submit it to the same tests."‡

The preceding extracts suffice to set at rest the question as to Odin's real existence; we have still to determine his approximate date. Sharon Turner supplies the following material for this.§ The date of Cerdic, the ninth from Odin, was 495; of Ida, the tenth, 547; of Ella, the eleventh, 560. Allowing twenty-five years as a fair average, the date of Odin would be 270, 297, or 285. Again, "Snorre gives thirty-two reigns between Odin and Harald Harfragre

\* Haigh's *Conquest of Britain by the Saxons*, p. 121.

† p. 110.

‡ Mr. Haigh works this out at length in a series of most interesting and instructive passages.

§ pp. 430, 450.

Almost all the kings perished violently, therefore the average of their reigns cannot exceed twenty years. This computation would place Odin about 220 A.D." In such a case it cannot be unfair to strike the mean between the earlier and later dates; I shall therefore consider Odin to have flourished, and to have had sons grown to manhood, soon after the year 250.\*

One of the earliest traditions of the Saxons, accepted not only by their own chroniclers, but also by more than one modern historian, makes *Odin a Scüthic leader of an enormous multitude of Scüths from the banks of the Dniepr into Western Germany. This is nothing less than the record of the third, last, and largest migration of Scüthic-Israel to the shores of the German Ocean.* A detailed account of this migration is contained in the old Saxon tradition, which I will proceed to give at length as a portion of the history of the tribes of the captivity.

This great movement was said to be due to the aggressive movements of the Romans. This exactly agrees with the continual attempts made by different Roman emperors, during the first two centuries A.D., to subdue the districts beyond the Danube bordering on the Carpathian Mountains. Odin's starting point is given as *Äs-gard, the metropolis of a mighty empire, situated near the Tanais.* This Äs-gard was none other than the modern *Kiev*,† a flourishing Russian city on the river *Dniepr*. The name itself seems bound up with different stages of the history of exiled Israel. The district of *Asgerd* in Armenia, and the town *Ascipurgium* or *Asburg* in the Caucasus, are evidence of this. Moreover, the meaning of Äsgard, "City of God,"‡ is a most striking undesigned coincidence, being nothing else than the remembrance of Jerusalem, the Holy City, carried about through the whole period of their European

\* The later date for Odin (about 300 A.D.) is favoured by the following facts. In the line of descent from his eldest son, the 8th from Odin died in 560, the 14th in 748. In that from the second son, the 13th died in 749; from the third, the 11th died in 709; from the fourth, who had two sons, in one line the 13th died 718, 19th died 901; in the other line, 9th died 559, 16th died 800; from the fifth, 10th died 588; and from the sixth, the 16th from Odin died in 799.

† *Spruner's Historical Atlas.*

‡ *Äs* being the singular of *Äsir*, "Gods." This, however, is not likely to have been the original meaning, for Odin's Scüths were known as *Äsir*; but arose, probably, after Odin himself had been deified. The Armenian local names noted in an earlier place (p. 54) are variously spelt *-asgerd* or *-ashkert*. There is also a district of *Ar-ish-kert*. May not the groundwork of these various forms be the Hebrew *ish*, "man"? In this case, *Äsir* would mean "The People" *par excellence*—"The Chosen People."

wanderings. The "mighty empire" undoubtedly refers to the dominions of Scüthic-Israel between the Dniepr and the Carpathians. Certain it is that this region, and that previously noticed as Dacia, were both, shortly after A.D. 250, entirely occupied by the Goths, a distinct race of immigrants from Scandinavia.

Having gathered together his multitudinous followers, the great warrior left once and for all the country which, for upwards of eight centuries, had given a home to exiled Israel. Advancing at first northwards up the course of the Dniepr towards the Baltic, the first people with whom he came into hostile contact was a section of the Sarmatians. These in all probability were the Goths and Vandals, who were settled in the country about the mouth of the Vistula. Having dispossessed them of their sea-coast territory, he drove them towards the interior parts of the continent, and himself turned westwards, in a direction parallel to the Baltic coast-line. Here he similarly dispossessed various "German" tribes of their original territory, and sent them southwards towards the Danube. Now there is distinct trace of such a movement as this in the contemporary annals of the Roman Empire. *The commencement of the year 254, as Gibbon narrates,\* was marked by a sudden invasion of the Empire by German tribes simultaneously at different parts.* For some time previously the Germans had attempted no inroads on a large scale, but the whole period of the administration of Valerian, who was proclaimed Emperor late in A.D. 253, "was one series of confusion and calamity, and the Roman Empire was continually invaded by the Franks, the Alemanni, and the Goths." From this very period, which on other grounds we have assigned as the probable date of Odin's migration, the German tribes seem pressed on to the Roman provinces by an irresistible force. Moreover, this exactly falls in with the traditional account of Odin's movements. Thus not only did Israel bear the brunt of the destruction of the Roman power, but actually drove against it those nations which were destined to complete the work. This is not to be lightly passed over.

To proceed with the account of Odin: after passing across the Vistula and the Oder, he reached the Elbe, where there were already the first representatives of Saxon-Israel. The officers under him, directing the expedition and fulfilling both military and priestly duties, *were twelve in number.* This is eminently an Israelitish number, and its occurrence in so marked a manner may fairly be claimed as another

\* *Decline and Fall*, ch. vi.

undesigned coincidence. Having peopled a considerable tract of country to the west of the Elbe, and setting his sons as princes of the different "Saxon" settlements in East "Saxony," Westphalia, Franconia, and Denmark, he left the limits of Germany. To this day a trace of his passage to the other side of the Baltic is contained in the *Odinsee*, i.e., Odin's-ey, or Odin's Island, applied to a town in the Danish isle of Fünen. The sequel I will give in the words of an authority already quoted. "Passing over into Sweden, he was allowed to form a settlement there, by Gylf, the king of the country, who, knowing that he had no force to oppose him, adopted the wiser policy of receiving him amicably. A desirable site was chosen, the city of Sigtun founded, a temple built therein, and sacrifices established according to the rites of Asa-land.\* Lastly, Norway was invaded, subdued, and given by Woden to Saeming, who appears to have been born, as well as other sons, after his father's arrival in the north."† Another historian says,‡ "In the old Swedish legends it is related that Odin founded the Empire of the Svea, and built a great temple at a spot called Sigtuna, near Lake Maelar, in the present province of Upland, which was known by the Northmen under the name of the "Lesser Swithiód," to distinguish it from that "Greater Swithiód" or Scüthia,§ from which they believed he had led his followers. When Odin arrived with his *twelve pontiffs, or chief priests*, he is said to have found that *great part of the land was occupied by a people who, like himself, had come from Swithiód*; but in such long ages past that, according to their own account, no one could fix the time. These people, who call themselves "Göta" or "Gauta," Goths, and boasted that they had driven all the dwarfs, giants, and Fenni (Finns and Lapps) of the country back into the mountains and dreary wastes, were so strong, that Odin was forced to make a compact with their King Gylfe before he could settle in the land." Will the reader kindly refer to the previous passage, where, in accounting for the name and origin of the historic Goths, I supposed there was an early colony of Israel in Sweden. That supposition was made in entire ignorance of the tradition that Odin, on entering Sweden, found people already there who traced their origin to Scüthia. The striking nature of this coincidence must surely be admitted.

\* i.e., "The Land of the Gods," "The Land of God," or "The Holy Land."

† Haigh, p. 122.

‡ Otté's *Scandinavia*, p. 59.

§ Hence it is evident that *Scüth* and *Suede* are only two forms of the same name, through the variant *Scüth*.

As regards the general nature of this great movement, Snorre Sturleson, the ancient chronicler who preserved the traditional account, says, that Odin and his fellow Scüths, "by their *noble appearance, superior prowess, and higher intelligence*, easily vanquished the inferior races of those lands, and *persuaded them that they were of godlike origin.*" In the whole account, says Mr. Haigh, "there is nothing improbable. It is a simple narrative of an expedition, by a comparatively civilized race, through reigions inhabited by peoples less advanced than they, by a race who had the address *to consolidate by the arts of peace the conquests of the sword.* No wonder that success everywhere attended them, that plenty and prosperity followed them, that the dynasties they established remained secure."\*

I mentioned, above, Odin's conquest of Norway. After that event he returned into Sweden, and, perceiving that his end was near, he anticipated nature by a self-inflicted death. Thus died a man whose arms were always said to be attended by victory, whose achievements were so glorious that he was deified after his death. Like Arminius, a hero of Israel and of the British nation, only far more famous than he, the most prominent figure in the whole course of Israel's wanderings, he passed away, and an ungrateful posterity has consigned his name and his achievements to an almost impenetrable oblivion.

\* p. 122.





### CHAPTER XIII.

#### ISRAEL SETTLED ON THE GERMAN OCEAN.

*Sudden increase of the Saxon power after the date of Odin's arrival—Saxons, Kimbri, and Jutes or Goths—Angles—Danes—Maximin—Naval enterprise of the Franks and Saxons—The Saxons help Carausius, a British usurper of the Imperial power—Great power of the Saxons towards the close of the Fourth Century—The Saxons: their (1) Language, (2) National Character, (3) Manners and Customs—The religion of Odin. A.D. 260 to 400.*

**I**F evidence were still wanting as to the truth of the large Scüthic or Saxon immigration under Odin into the district between the Elbe and the German Ocean, it would be found in the sudden and remarkable change undergone by the "Saxons" after the middle of the third century A.D. "Their power rose to a height unheard-of among the barbarians of the North, and they were enabled to put forth those countless swarms who gained the sovereignty of the sea."\* It will be well at this point to give a brief description of the country gradually occupied by them—their new settlement on the shores of the German Sea. This district corresponded to the modern Holland, Hanover, Brunswick, Oldenburg, Mecklenburg, Holstein, Schleswig, Jütland, and the neighbouring islands which form with it the kingdom of Denmark, and also the southern province of Sweden, still called Gota-land, or Gothland, with its capital Gothenborg. The extent of this tract, North and South, was exactly that of the island of Great Britain, *i.e.*, between 50° and 60° N. latitude; its breadth embraced ten degrees of longitude, between 3° and 13° E. of Greenwich; the area, roughly speaking, being 75,000 square miles. The coast of Holland, though under the dominion of Israel, was occupied by the Frisians, of whose nationality I am doubtful. With the exception of an Assyrian

\* *Chronological Tables of Ancient History*, compiled from the best authorities.



tribe, the Teutoni, in Mecklenburg, the rest of this area was occupied, under various names, by sections of the Tribes of the Captivity.

Thus *Saxons* recalls *Sakai*; *Angles* brings to mind that Ephraim was called *Engel*, "a heifer;" the *Jutes*, *Kimbri*, or *Danes*, recall the *Scüths* and *Kimmerians*, and, further back, the colony of *Danites* in the North of the land of Israel; while the *Goths* of South Sweden, identical in name with those of *Füt-land*, give the clue to a difficulty which still remains for consideration. It is most striking to find once more side by side the three names which we found attaching to Israel on their escape from the land of their captivity. *Sakai*, *Scüthai*, *Kimmerii*, then. *Saxons*, *Futes*, *Kimbri*, now. Another form of Jutes is *Geatas*, i.e., Goths, Gétæ, Sagétai, or Scüths. An old Danish chronicle\* contains the remarkable tradition that *the Danes and Futes are Jews (!) of the Tribe of Dan*. The founder of the Danish kingdom is given under the name of Dan.

Shortly before the arrival of Odin, we hear of the furious devastations of the Roman usurper, Maximin, for 400 miles beyond the Rhine. These ravages are considered by Sharon Turner to have been "favourable to the growth of the Saxon power; for they depopulated the contiguous states, and left the Saxons without any strong † neighbours to coerce or endanger them."

The decade from 270 to 280 was marked by an event of the greatest importance as tending to develope the maritime enterprise of the Saxons. The account is well worth giving in full, as it is described by the Historian of the Anglo-Saxons ‡:—

"An active system of naval enterprise is not naturally chosen by any nation. Hence the Saxons might have lived amid their rocks and marshes, conflicting with their neighbours, or sailing about them in petty vessels for petty warfare, till they had mouldered away in the vicissitudes in which so many tribes perished, if one remarkable incident, not originating from themselves, but from a Roman Emperor, had not excited their peculiar attention to maritime expeditions on a large scale, with grander prospects and to countries far remote. This event, which tinged with new and lasting colours the destiny of Europe, by determining the Saxons to piratical enterprises, was the daring achievements of Francs§; whom Probus, during his

\* *Vetus Chronicon Holsatie*, p. 54.

† Vol. I., p. 135,

‡ Sh. Turner, I., pp. 137—140.

§ Elsewhere said to be Francs and Saxons. As Francs, i.e., "Free-men," was simply the name of a confederation, it is quite possible that these may have entirely belonged to the Saxon race. The authorities for this account are Zosimus, I; Eumen. Paneg. IV., 18; and Vopiscus in Probo, c. 18.

brief sovereignty, had transported to the Pontus. . . . Among others a numerous body of Franks, or rather of the contiguous tribes united under that name, was transplanted to the Euxine. . . . They soon afterwards seized the earliest opportunity of abandoning their foreign settlement. *They possessed themselves of many ships*, probably the vessels in which they had been carried from the German Ocean to the Euxine, and formed the daring plan of sailing back to the Rhine. Its novelty and improbability procured its success; and the necessities which attended it led them to great exploits. Compelled to land wherever they could get supplies, safety, and information, they ravaged the coasts of Asia and Greece. Reaching at length Sicily, they attacked and ravaged Syracuse with great slaughter. Sailing at last to Europe, they concluded their remarkable voyage by *reaching in safety their native shores*. In this singular enterprise, a system to endure for ages received its birth. It discovered to themselves and their neighbours, to all who heard and could imitate, that from the Roman Empire a rich harvest of spoil might be gleaned by those who would seek for it at sea. It likewise removed the veil of terror that hung over distant oceans and foreign expeditions. These Franks had desolated every province almost with impunity, and perhaps the same adventurers, embarking again with new followers, evinced by fresh booty the practicability of similar attempts. On land, the Roman tactics and discipline were generally invincible; but, at sea, they who most frequent it are usually the most expert and successful. The Saxons perceived this consequence; their situation on the ocean tempted them to make the trial; they soon afterwards began their depredations, and by this new habit evinced the inciting and instructive effects of the Frankish adventure."

The year 287 witnessed the first contact of Saxon-Israel with the Isles of the West. Carausius, a British usurper of the Imperial dignity, invited them to his aid, and encouraged their application to the trials of the sea. Sixty years later this was repeated by Magnentius, another usurper. Both of these events tended not only to increase the maritime skill of the Saxons, but also to draw them into closer contact with the British Isles.

With the commencement of the fourth century the Saxons extended their supremacy to the Rhine; and by the year 370,\* "such was the power of the Saxon Confederation, that they were

\* Sh. Turner, I, p. 149. "The Saxon Confederation" means the combination of Saxons, Angles, Jutes, and Danes, who were all different branches of the Tribes of the Captivity.

now bold enough to *defy the Roman armies* by land, and invaded the regions on the Rhine with a formidable force. *The Imperial General was unable to repulse them*; a reinforcement encouraged him. The Saxons declined a battle, and sued for an amicable accommodation. It was granted . . . . The Romans were not ashamed to confess their dread of the invaders by a perfidious violation of the Treaty. They attacked the retreating Saxons from an ambush, and after a brave resistance the unguarded barbarians were slain or made prisoners. The loss was soon repaired in the natural progress of population; and before many years elapsed, they renewed their depredations and defeated Maximus. At the close of the fourth century they exercised the activity and resources of Stilicho. After his death, the Saxons commenced new irruptions. They supported the Armorici in their rebellion, aided the Gothic Euric, began to war with the Franks; and, extending the theatre of their spoil, *made Belgium, Gaul, Italy, and Germany tremble at their presence.*" These are the last recorded actions of the Saxons in Germany before passing into Britain. From the first appearance of the Scüths and Kimmerians in Europe to the time of the departure of the Saxons from the Continent, during a period of eleven centuries, how true was it that, according to the prediction of Micah, "the remnant of Jacob (was) among the Gentiles, in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep: who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver." It was the same even to the very last; but towards the end the Roman armies were so demoralized, that they hardly seemed worthy objects for attack. The close of the fourth century witnessed the irruption of the Huns into Europe, who, with the German and Sarmatian nations, found no difficulty in completing the downfall of the Roman Empire.\*

The Saxons had no Herodotus to give a connected account of the details of their life. However, by a comparison of different authorities, it is possible to derive a great deal of information on this subject. I will arrange the facts I have been able to discover, each under its own separate head.

\* It seems not unlikely that the Huns were the means employed by Jehovah both to cause the Scüths under Odin to leave their old homes on the Black Sea, and the Saxons to cross into Britain. A hint of the former seems to be contained in one of the old Sagas, while the coincidence of the Empire of Attila with the latter seems to speak for itself.

## I. LANGUAGE.

To set forth the large number of English and Anglo-Saxon words of Hebrew origin, or the still larger number which bear marks of social contract with the Medes, would require a treatise in itself. But there are some interesting facts about the early Saxon alphabetical characters which are probably new to many, and may be given with advantage in this place. That they employed alphabetical characters, before their contact with those of Rome and Greece, is certain. The old *Runes* are undoubted letters; they were in use before the spread of Christianity to the northern nations, and their origin is ascribed to Odin. "Either," says Sharon Turner,\* "the Pagan Saxons were acquainted with the Runic characters, or they were introduced in the North after the fifth century, when the Saxons came to Britain, and before the middle of the sixth, when they are mentioned by Fortunatus, which is contrary to the history and traditions of the Scandinavian nations, and to probability. *Run* is used in Anglo-Saxon, as *Runar* in Icelandic, to express letters or characters. . . . As the Anglo-Saxons were not inferior in civilization to any of the barbarous nations of the North, it cannot be easily supposed that they were ignorant of Runic characters, if their neighbours used them. . . . The Saxons had terms of their own, not borrowed from Latin, for alphabetical letters. The art of using letters, or writing, is also expressed in Saxon by a verb not of Roman origin. In like manner the Saxons did not derive their word for 'book' from *liber*." Another authority notices *numerous points of resemblance between the Runic alphabet and those of the ancient Phoenicians and Hebrews*.† The *futhorc*, or Runic alphabet, originated "clearly in times of primitive antiquity. The nomenclature of the *Phoenician-Hebrew* alphabet is admitted to indicate its having originated in a primitive state of society, and that of the *futhorc* has precisely the same character. *Indeed it is remarkable how many of the objects named are common to both, how identical was the feeling which dictated in each case the choice of the symbols . . . the remarkable coincidence in both systems, commencing with the names of domestic cattle.*" One of the earliest of these *futhorcs* consisted of *sixteen runes*; so also did the early Phoenician. As in Phoenician and Hebrew, so on Runic monuments in Norway and Sweden, writing is

\* I., 234—237.

† Haigh's *Conquest of Britain*, pp. 33, 68, 88, 106, 107.

found *from right to left*. In the symbols employed there are several striking points of coincidence. "*Aleph*, the first character of the Hebrew and Phœnician alphabet, was the head of an ox with its horns; *Fœh*, the first letter of the Runic, with the same meaning, is but a variant of the same symbol, and corresponds very nearly with the Samaritan character . . . . *Thorn*, the third rune, is certainly allied to *Daleth*, and as the latter is a 'door,' so we may regard the former (of which *Thur* is one of the variants) as *thurn* or *durn*, with the same signification. The Phœnician-Hebrew letters *Koph* and *Resch* signify and symbolize the 'head'; the Greek *Rho* is identical with the primitive *Resch*; the Latin *R* and the Runic *Ræd* differ from it only in the addition of a beard; whilst the Runic *Wæn*, again, has the primitive form. . . . The Phœnician *Cheth* or *Heth* has sometimes exactly the form of the Anglo-Saxon *Hægel*; it means and represents an 'enclosure' or 'park,' and it is very probable that *Hægel* means the same, for *hæge* is a 'hedge,' and *hægian* to 'hedge' would admit of a derivative noun *hægel*. . . . The Phœnician-Hebrew *Lamed* is a 'whip,' 'rod' or 'goad'; the Runic *Lagu* has the form of a 'whip,' the symbol of authority in Egyptian hieroglyphics, and there cannot be a doubt that its meaning is 'law.' *Calc* has precisely the form of the thunderbolt which characterises *Nin* in the Assyrian sculptures, and when his title, *Khalk-halla*, 'brother of the lightning,' and the name of his father's sacred city *Kalk-ha*, are considered, we cannot doubt but that the word signified what the form of the character denotes. *Stan* has the form in which the Phœnicians cast their pigs of tin, and is stamped as a symbol on one so formed, found in Cornwall, and now in Truro Museum; it is therefore extremely probable that the word, like the Latin *stannum*, means 'tin.' Lastly, the Runic copulative sign has precisely the ancient form of *Vau*, which means a 'hook,' and as such became in Hebrew the copulative conjunction. Thus we see that the Phœnician alphabet and the Anglo-Saxon *futhorc* are derived from a common source; that the same feeling dictated the choice of the symbols, which were to be used as letters in each case; and that each letter represents the initial sound of the name of the corresponding symbol."

It must be remembered that the regular square Hebrew type was a comparatively late growth, and that the early Phœnician-Hebrew forms would be those with which the Israelites, prior to 700 B.C., were acquainted. A careful comparison of these old Alphabets with the Runic seems irresistibly to suggest the impression

that the latter consisted of the old Hebrew letters, as nearly as permitted by the break-up of tradition during centuries of war and migration. For there are many cases where the very same form is used for two different letters in the Hebrew and the Runic Alphabets.

## 2. NATIONAL CHARACTER.

The history already given of the Saxons contains many allusions to their national character. The following general remarks, however, may be added. The Emperor Julian described them as *distinguished amongst their neighbours for vehemence and valour*. "Zosimus expresses the general feeling of his age when he ranks them as *superior to others in energy, strength, and warlike fortitude*." \* Their pride of mind would not permit them to endure disgrace. Their persons were large and comely, and they were so proud of their descent, and so anxious to perpetuate their manly characteristics, that *they were averse from marriages with other nations*. Thus was Israel sifted through the sieve, but not one grain was allowed to fall to the ground.

## 3. MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

Many of the customs of the Anglo-Saxons point to their Hebrew origin. Thus the use of the terms "se'n-night" (week) and "fort-night" show that they reckoned time by nights instead of days. A special case of this is given in the regulation that "if a hireling, by his master's orders, do any menial work from sunset on Saturday till the eve of Monday, his master is to pay him eighty shillings."† They observed the New Moon. The number *twelve* was prominent in their ceremonies: thus there were twelve warrior-priests of Odin; also Thor's statue resembled a crowned king with twelve bright golden stars encircling his head. Again, there was a striking coincidence between the Saxon and Hebrew religious festivals. The Saxon September ceremonies corresponded to the Day of Atonement and Feast of Tabernacles, the Saxons even building themselves *huts of the boughs of trees*. This was probably the Yule festival before it was changed, as the old histories record, to mid-winter. "Our Christmas Holly," so one writer tells us, "is a reminiscence of the *feasting booths, adorned with evergreens*, which the pagan Anglo-Saxons set up at Yule-tide in the neighbourhood of their temples."‡

\* Sh. Turner, I, p. 200.

† Metcalfe's *Englishman and Scandinavian*, p. 97.

‡ *Ib.* p. 105.

The time of the intermediate one of the *three* great Saxon festivals is not so certain; but that dedicated to Eostre, the later Easter, always corresponded to the Hebrew Paschal feast. There is resemblance, too, in points of detail in laws; and all these facts bear strong testimony to their Hebrew origin. Again, the Scüths, according to Herodotus, told stories of men who had the power of changing at pleasure into wolves. In like manner, to the Saxon converts, the enemy of man was described as a "were wolf," for they "bethought them of that old wide-spread belief of their forefathers, that there were people who could change into wolves for a time, and forsake the abodes of men." This strange tradition connects the Saxons with the Scüths. The following facts connect both with Israel. It will be remembered that the Israelites were to be "many days without a king." We see how this was the case in Scüthia; it was still more plainly true in Saxony. "The most ancient account of the Saxon government on the continent exists in this short but expressive passage of Bede. 'The ancient Saxons have *no king*, but many chiefs set over their people, who, when war presses, draw lots equally, and whomsoever the chance points out, they all follow as leader, and obey during the war. The war concluded, all the chiefs become again of equal power.' In the Lindenb. Gloss. 1347, the following occurs: '*Twelve* Ethelings governed over the land of the Saxons; and whenever war arose in that land, the Saxons chose one of the twelve to be king while the war lasted; when the war was finished, the twelve became alike.'"<sup>\*</sup> We traced the Scüthic custom of divining by rods to the Israelitish practice of "taking counsel at their staffs." The same habit marked the Saxons. "They cut a small branch of a fruit-tree into twigs, marked them, and scattered them at random on a white vest. The priest, if it were a public council, or the father, at a private consultation, prayed, gazed at heaven, drew each three times, and interpreted according to the mark previously impressed. Alfred also says they cast lots with twigs."<sup>†</sup>

The religion of Odin was a distinctly high form of faith. It included the belief in the immortality of the soul, and in a beneficent All-father in Heaven, who made the heaven, and earth, and air out of nothing; in the future purifying of the world by fire, a catastrophe connected with the embodiment of evil, who is frequently described


<sup>\*</sup> Sh. Turner, I., 207.

<sup>†</sup> *Id.* I., 223.

as a serpent or a dragon ; in a new world that is to come, and in the advent of " the powerful one " for judgment, and victory over evil. How could a nation just emerged from the depths of barbarism have a faith like this ? Did God deal with any other people as He did with the nation He had formed for Himself, to be His inheritance for ever ?







## CHAPTER XIV.

### THE MIGRATIONS OF ISRAEL INTO BRITAIN.

*The Romans abandon Britain—Hengist and Horsa—First Saxon settlement in Britain—Saxon Oclarchy—The Danes—Scots, Kymry, Saxons—No Anglo-Saxons left in Germany—The "Teutonic" Theory—The Scandinavian question. A.D. 400 to 900.*

**T**HE Romans, never happy in their attempt to keep Britain in subjection, were at length compelled to desist. In A.D. 414 they publicly proclaimed their inability to defend the country against attack. It is a great mistake to regard Britain as ever forming an integral part of the Roman empire. Speaking of that period in the history of our island home, Lord Macaulay says : "She received only a faint tincture of Roman arts and letters. Of the Western provinces which obeyed the Cæsars, she was *the last that was conquered and the first that was flung away*. No magnificent remains of Latian porches and aqueducts are to be found in Britain. No writer of British birth is reckoned among the masters of Latian poetry and eloquence. It is not probable that the islanders were at any time generally familiar with the tongue of their Italian rulers. From the Atlantic to the vicinity of the Rhine the Latin has, during many centuries, been predominant. It drove out the Keltic ; it was not driven out by the Teutonic ; and it is at this day the basis of the French, Spanish, and Portuguese languages. In our island the Latin appears never to have superseded the old Gaelic speech, and could not stand its ground against the German." Thus the attempted subjugation of Britain was unsuccessful to the end ; whence it follows that in the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was to be divided—the ten horns which mark the last stage of Daniel's Fourth Beast—Britain can have no place.

In the year 449 three ships manned by Saxons, under two chieftains, Hengist and Horsa, were cruising off the south-eastern

coast of the island. Vortigern, a British prince, being hard pressed by the Picts, invited their assistance. Obeying this call, they landed at Ebbes-fleet, at the mouth of the river Stour, in Kent; and in course of their campaign on behalf of the Britons, they "*had the victory wherever they went.*" In reward for their services they received the Island of Thanet, the first permanent settlement of Saxon Israel in Britain. Five years later, Vortigern fell in love with Rowena, the daughter of Hengist, and, on his marriage with her, gave up some more territory to her father. Thus Kent became the first Saxon kingdom, A.D. 454. Drawn on by the good report of the new country sent by Hengist and his followers, a fresh band, again in three ships, crossed the intervening ocean in 476; and their leader, Ella, subsequently founded the kingdom of the South Saxons, whose name survives in the modern Sussex. In 495 a third and larger body arrived, in five ships, under Cerdic; these settled in the West, as the West Saxons of the kingdom of Wessex; and from this period to 586 other settlements were formed, as will be seen from the following table :—

KINGDOM.	EXTENT.	FOUNDER.	DATE.
1. Kent.	Modern Kent.	Hengist.	454
2. Sussex.	Sussex and Surrey.	Ella.	490
3. Wessex	Counties west of Sussex and south of the Thames, excepting Cornwall.	Cerdic.	519
4. Essex.	Essex, Middlesex, and parts of Herts.	Ercenwin.	527
5. Bernicia.	Northumberland, and part of Scotland.	Ida.	547
6. Deira.	Yorkshire and Durham.	Ella.	560
7. East Anglia.	Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridge.	Uffa.	575
8. Mercia.	Central Counties.	Gridda.	586

It is usual to talk of the Saxon Heptarchy, or collection of seven states, but the foregoing list plainly shows that there were at first *eight distinct settlements*. Several good authorities speak of the *Odarchy*, or collection of eight kingdoms. Sharon Turner's account of this is to the point. He says: "*Eight Anglo-Saxon Governments were established in the island. This state of Britain has been improperly denominated the Saxon Heptarchy. When all the kingdoms were settled, they formed an Octarchy. . . . As the Anglo-Saxons warred*

with each other, sometimes one State was for a time absorbed by another ; sometimes after an interval it emerged again. If that term ought to be used which expresses the complete establishment of the Anglo-Saxons, it should be Octarchy ; if not, then the denomination must vary as the tide of conquest fluctuated . . . . *Octarchy is the appellation that best suits the historical truth.*"\* This fact is the natural sequel of the *eight tribes of Scythia*, and the *eight Tribes carried captive* into Media.

Christianity was introduced amongst the new settlers in the year 597, and, making gradual but steady progress, had won, before the end of the next century, the last heathen Saxon kingdom. But Saxon Christianity was brought from Rome. The Kymry preserved a purer form of the true faith, received by them in the first century of the Christian æra, and retreating with them into the mountain strongholds of the West ; if, as is commonly assumed, it was completely extinguished in Saxon Britain.

The struggle between Saxon and Briton was not, as some have supposed, a war to the death ; still a struggle there was. All Israel had to find a home in the Isles of the West ; therefore the Kymry had to give way before the Angles, the Saxons, and the Jutes. The warfare that we read of was all part of God's plan for establishing His people in their "little sanctuary," wherein they might "renew their strength."

In like manner, the Danes had to find a resting-place in Britain. The name *Dane* I apply to that colony of Dan-ites in the north of Palestine, which, being situated inland, must have been included in the captivity, and to which I have alluded more than once. But those who bore the name in history, were, it seems to me, too numerous to be accounted for as the descendants of that colony. While the Saxon Octarchy would include the main body of each of the Eight Tribes of the Captivity, remnants of them all still remained in Denmark and Scandinavia. And in the Danish invasions of the Saxon settlements in Britain, I find the passage of a fresh body of Israel into their appointed home.

The year 787 marks the first inroad of the Danes into Britain, and for more than two centuries there were continual struggles in consequence of their endeavours to obtain a footing. Fierce, however, as was the strife between the Saxon and the Dane, a time came when, as Lord Macaulay narrates, "the mutual aversion of the races began to

\* I., pp. 309, 310.

subside. Inter-marriage became frequent. The Danes learned the religion of the Saxons; and thus one cause of deadly animosity was removed. The Danish and Saxon tongues, both dialects of one widespread language, were blended together. But the distinction between the two nations was by no means effaced, when an event took place which prostrated both, in common slavery and degradation, at the feet of a third people." Who this third people was, and what it was which was wanted to complete Israel's occupation of the Western Isles, still remains to be shown. So far, we have traced into their resting-place the Two Tribes who escaped the Captivity, and the Eight, who were carried captive; and these united show one representative of each of the three names with which we are so familiar—*Scots, Kymry, Saxons*.

The Two Tribes and the Eight, the two divisions whose fortunes I have been considering hitherto, make up the Ten ruled over by Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and his successors. These were Ephraim, Manasseh, Dan, Simeon, Asher, Naphthali, Zebulun, Issachar, Reuben, and Gad. The house of David continued to rule over three tribes, Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. Thus the full number of the tribes was *thirteen*, for of Joseph came two tribes. Ephraim and Manasseh were as much distinct tribes as any of those descended directly from the sons of Jacob. Israel himself, on his death bed, so constituted them. "Ephraim and Manasseh," we hear him say, "are mine. As Reuben and Simeon they shall be mine."\* In the division of the land of Canaan, Levi received no allotment. The number twelve was made up by the two tribes of Joseph. Two facts remain to be noted. In the sealing of the tribes in the Apokalypse, Joseph (*i.e.* Ephraim) and Manasseh are separately sealed. Again, in the division of the land of Israel at the final restoration,† there will be two portions for Joseph, one for Ephraim and one for Manasseh; and on that occasion territory is to be assigned to Levi. Thus the Tribes of Israel are in all thirteen.

Before leaving this portion of the subject, there remains for consideration a question of the greatest importance. It has long been a commonplace with a large class of writers on philology, to speak of the English and German languages as two dialects of a common "Teutonic" tongue, and of the Anglo-Saxons and Germans as being similarly allied in race.

The first point is assumed by these writers, the second follows, in their estimation, as a consequence of the first. Of late, however,

\* Gen. xlvii. 5.

† Ezekiel xlviii.

philologists have been brought to comprehend a truth, which, once stated, seems self-evident, viz. :—that language is *not* a certain test of race. The immediate consequence of this proposition, considered with reference to our present question, is this :—If the English language were admitted to be identical, both in vocabulary and in structure with the German, it still would not follow that English and German are one in race. But are the two languages identical? By no means. The English language differs essentially from the German in *grammatic structure* and *idiomatic texture*. These, and not vocabulary, are the true tests of close affinity. The striking nature of the differences is very clearly shown in *Israel in Britain*,\* the author of which enumerates the following characteristics of German grammar and idiom, “the position of the verb in the sentence, and its inverted form; the formation of the verb, particularly of *seyn*, to be; the apparently arbitrary distribution of gender; the declension of the noun by terminal inflexion; the declension of the adjective as a noun; the declension, by inflexion, of the demonstrative pronoun and definite article; and, in idiom, the circumlocution often necessary to express the simplest proposition.”† Thus the evidence of language points to only one conclusion, namely, that there is a radical ethnic difference between Anglo-Saxons and Germans. Historical research, as far as is possible, confirms this conclusion. One traveller in Germany gives us, as the result of his investigations, that “*the mother tongue of the present English—Anglo-Saxon—is extinct on the continent*, wholly replaced by high German as the literary language, and by Platt-Deutsch as the speech of the country people.”‡ Again, from Sharon Turner’s history we find that “Bede affirms the complete emigration of the Angles; he says their country, *ab eo tempore usque hodie manere desertus*.”§ The Israelite origin of the Anglo-Saxons does not, therefore, carry with it the Israelite origin of the Germans. Indeed, if the latter be of Israel, then is Israel not in Britain.

With the “Scandinavian” races, however, the case seems to me to be different. The research into language, the result of which has been given above, did not apply to them. We need a close comparison of their languages with the different forms of “German” speech. The way in which the traditions of Odin are bound up

\* London : W. H. Guest, 20, Warwick Lane, Paternoster Row. Price 4d.

† p. 11.

‡ Latham’s *Germania of Tacitus*, p. 116.

§ *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, I., p. 312.


equally with the "Saxon" and the "Scandinavian" mythology, as well as several marked points of resemblance between English and Swedish customs, is a strong argument in favour of the Israelitish origin of the present Swedes, Danes, and Norwegians. It is quite possible to suppose that small sections of Israel never reached the Isles of the West, and yet to believe that the British Nation is the Nation of Israel, including the greater part of each of the different Tribes within its limits. This is, undoubtedly, a question which deserves the careful attention of the studious searcher—the more so as it is the Scandinavian branch which, almost alone, has preserved the later history of the Scüths, which is one of the essential links in the chain connecting Palestine with Britain. Indeed the only ancient Saxon composition—*Beowulf*—composed from stories brought into England by them from their German home, is identical in style and matter with one of the Scandinavian Sagas. The Scandinavians—at the most but a small remnant—are no unworthy candidates for a place in the nation of Israel.




PART III.



ISRAEL UNITED.







## CHAPTER XV.

### BENJAMIN.

*Benjamin—Prophesied character—Lent to Judah—Jeremiah's prophecy to Benjamin—Zachariah's prophecy—Benjamin received Christ—Christian Benjamin escaped the siege of Jerusalem—The early Asiatic Churches—Benjamin and the Galatians.*

**O**NE of the Tribes of Israel held a peculiar position in relation to the divided state of the Hebrew nation. This was the Tribe of Benjamin, the history of which deserves careful study from the very outset.

The 35th chapter of Genesis narrates how Jacob was returning from Padan-Aram, he and all his company, and they came to Bethel. Here, at the scene of the heavenly vision, "God appeared unto Jacob again, and blessed him . . . and He called His name Israel. And God said unto him, I am God Almighty; be fruitful and multiply; *a nation and a company of nations* shall be of thee." Leaving Bethel after this eventful promise, they came near to Ephrath, the later Bethlehem. Here Rachel died in bringing Benjamin into the world. "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, that she called his name Ben-oni ('Son of my Sorrow'); but his father called him Ben-jamin ('Son of my Right Hand')." Rachel was Jacob's best-loved wife. Her sons, Joseph and Benjamin, were his most favoured children. In this partiality was foreshown a future destiny, subsequently unfolded by the utterances of men inspired by God, and now worked out in history, so that "he who runs may read."

"When Joseph's ten brethren went down to buy corn in Egypt, Benjamin, Joseph's brother, Jacob sent not with his brethren; for he said, Lest peradventure mischief befall him."\* On the second occasion Jacob said, "My son shall not go down with you; for his

\* Gen. xlii. 3.

brother is dead, and he is left alone: if mischief befall him by the way in the which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave." Thus was Benjamin the favourite of his father, who therein acted by an impulse from God.

The last days of the old patriarch came, and he gave his final blessings to his sons. These blessings were inspired prophecies of the future history of each tribe. The concluding one runs in these words: "*Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf*: in the morning he shall devour the prey, and at night he shall divide the spoil."

Once again, four hundred years later, an inspired prophet, Moses, the man of God, gave his dying blessings to the tribes. His words are these: "And of Benjamin he said, *the beloved of the Lord* shall dwell in safety by him; and the Lord shall cover him all the day long, and he shall dwell between his shoulders." \* Thus a future was foretold for Benjamin markedly distinct from that of any of the other tribes.

Let us now pass on to the time when the Tribal Nation has grown to manhood; when it has lost the king of its choice, and God has laid the foundations of a throne which is to endure; when, after continual struggling, the "envy of Ephraim" has come to a head, and division has become inevitable. Ahijah and Jeroboam are walking in the field, and the latter has clad himself in a new garment.† "And Ahijah caught the new garment and *rent it into twelve pieces*: and he said unto Jeroboam, Take thee ten pieces, for thus saith the Lord, . . . *I will take the kingdom out of his son's hand, and will give it to thee, even ten tribes, and unto his son will I give one tribe.*" Again, God says to Solomon: "Howbeit I will not rend away all the kingdom, but will give *one tribe* to thy son."‡ *By this One Tribe undoubtedly Benjamin is meant.* One commentator says it means Judah with Benjamin absorbed in it. But surely the *one Tribe* was as much One as the Ten Tribes immediately before were Ten; they were Ten single distinct Tribes; so with the One. The same commentator renders his own theory most improbable by the following note. "*The adhesion of Benjamin to Judah at this time comes upon us as a surprise. By blood Benjamin was far more closely connected with Ephraim than with Judah.* The long feud between David and Saul, the wars of Joab and Abner, and the murder of the latter by the former, together with the natural jealousy of the tribe that had lost the sovereignty towards the tribe that had gained it, tended to

\* Deut. xxxiii.

† 1 Kings xi. 30—39.

‡ 1 Kings xi. 11—13.

produce an estrangement of Benjamin from Judah, which it might have been expected would have still continued. . . . *Late in David's reign . . . the tribe of Benjamin was still opposed to him. . . .* But it would seem that in the half-century which had elapsed the feelings of the Benjamites had undergone a complete change !' *Independent hostility* immediately followed, without any visible cause, by *complete absorption* ! Is there no more satisfactory alternative ? Surely there is. Of the Twelve Tribes (territorial tribes) the *Ten* and the *One* referred to only constitute Eleven. The Twelfth was Judah, which was for all practical purposes the same as "the House of David." *David's throne being the fulfilment of the prophesied supremacy of Judah*, how should Judah have any choice in the matter ? On the one side we have Judah, on the other (the rest of) Israel, a distinction mentioned thirty-three times before the division of the kingdom. Now from David's house and his tribe Judah, or from Judah and their representative David's successor (the rest of) Israel was to be rent ; yet, in the working out of God's purposes, *not all the kingdom* was to be rent away at once, but *one tribe* was to be given or lent to Judah and their Royal House of David. *This tribe was Benjamin.* It was to be lent for a time and for a special purpose ; "*For David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem, which I have chosen. . . . That David my servant may have a light alway before me in Jerusalem.*"\* Jerusalem was in Benjamin ; therefore, once more, Benjamin must be meant. But it was not only to keep Jerusalem for David's house, that the loan of Benjamin was made ; but also that, while Judah and Jerusalem remained, be the times however troublous, there might be *a light burning before God* continually, a fire of holiness, the " candle-stick " of God's faithful Church. Was not this a fitting work to be given to the "*Beloved of the Lord* ?"

The centuries speed on. Israel is carried captive. The time of Judah's captivity draws near. About thirty years before that event, an inspired prophet proclaimed "*O ye children of Benjamin, gather yourselves to flee out of the midst of Jerusalem ; . . . for evil appeareth out of the north, and great destruction.*"† But this did not apply to the coming captivity. Nebuchadnezzar's hosts came *out of the East*, not the North. Neither did Benjamin obey the warning now, for they were taken captive with Judah, and shared Judah's lot, partly returning to Palestine, partly settling in the towns of Asia Minor.

\* 1 Kings xi. 13, 39.

† Jeremiah vi. 1.

At length the "fulness of the ages" came, and with it Judah's last probationary trial. *Christ came unto His own, but His own received Him not.* He came of Judah according to the flesh, but Judah cried, "His blood be on us, and on our children." From whom then did He draw His small band of faithful disciples and their followers? If His own rejected, who received, Him? *Benjamin*, the Light-bearing Tribe. Called Jews, but not of Judah, they mingled with the Jews, in Judæa, and on the Sea of Galilee—still "the Beloved of the Lord." Let us remember that Benjamin was really a Tribe of Israel; there still existed this association between Judah and Israel; but was it to last? No. The death of Christ broke that union. Then was fulfilled that which was foretold by Zachariah, "And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break My covenant which I had made with all the people. And it was broken in that day; and so the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of the *Lord*. And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. *So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver.* And the Lord said unto me, *Cast it unto the potter*: a goodly price that I was priced at of them. *And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.* Then I cut asunder mine other staff, even Bands, that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel."\* Thus in the grave of Christ the bond of union was buried, never to reappear till towards the time when He should come again. He rose, ascended to the Father's right hand, and sent the Comforter to His witnesses of the Tribe of Benjamin. The punishment of Judah came, destruction by the hands of a cruel nation coming out of the North. But Christian Benjamin escaped the Roman siege. Then was fulfilled the prophecy of Jeremiah already spoken of.

The escape of the Christian "Jews" from Jerusalem, before the horrors of the siege commenced, in consequence of a revelation from God, is established by the following evidence. Eusebius, born A.D. 264, records the fact in his *Historia Ecclesia*; nor does he cite any authority for his statement, thereby showing that he was giving a generally received tradition. He says: "The people of the church in Jerusalem were directed, by a warning given in a revelation to approved men among them, to remove from the city before the war commenced, and to take for their dwelling-place a city of Peræa, by name Pella; wherein, accordingly, they who believed on Christ abode,

after quitting Jerusalem."\* Now Josephus, the historian of the Roman siege of Jerusalem, narrates a most remarkable incident in the early part of the operations. Cestius Gallus, the Roman general, had already occupied the outer portions of the city. The war party in Jerusalem was for the moment cowed; the populace were preparing to invite Cestius within the walls. Had the Roman general been permitted to take advantage of these circumstances, the war would have been at an end and all the horrors of the siege averted. As it was, however, he withdrew from Jerusalem in a manner which was as unexpected as it was impolitic. The words in which Josephus records this inexplicable retreat are these:—"Cestius, perceiving neither the despair of the besieged nor the purpose of the popular party, suddenly recalled his troops; and, forming a ruinous resolution, justified by no blow to the hopes of the Romans, contrary to all expectation, he withdrew from the city."† This was the occasion, I take it, of Benjamin's escape.

Thus much concerning Benjamin in Jerusalem. There were also representatives of Benjamin spread over the whole length and breadth of Asia Minor; and, in the light of the previous line of remarks, it is not too much to say that the early Apostolic churches were mainly the fruit of the reception of the truth by Benjamin, and of the work of Paul, himself "an Israelite, of the Tribe of Benjamin." The previous arguments are, therefore, taken to support this conclusion, that *the Asiatic Christians of the first two centuries were mainly of the Tribe of Benjamin; one section of them, the Galatians, being, as already shown, Israelites of the Remnant which escaped.* But how did Benjamin and these "Keltic" Israelites join their brethren in the Isles of the West?

\* The passage in the original runs thus:— τοῦ λαοῦ (genitive absolute) τῆς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὺμοις ἐκκλησίας, κατὰ τινα χρόνον τοῖς αὐτοῖς δοαίμοις δι' ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκδοθέντα, πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου μεταπασθῆναι τῆς πόλεως καὶ τινα τῆς Περσίας πόλιν οἰκεῖν κεκαλυμμένον, (Πάλλαν αὐτὴν ἑνομήσουσιν.) ἐν ᾧ τῶν εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστευκότων ἀπὸ τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετακισμένων. Book III., 5. 2.

† *Wars of the Jews*, II., 19, 7. The word rendered "contrary to all expectation" is *παρὰ λόγον*. This word may also mean "without any show of reason."





## CHAPTER XVI.

### THE NORMANS.

*Benjamin and the Galatians carried captive to the N. W. of the Black Sea—They crossed over the continent to N. W. Germany, or more probably got round to the Saxon settlements by ship—The Normans of A.D. 1066—"Northmen"—The Norman character. A.D. 267 to 1066.*

**I**N the year A.D. 267, as we are told by Professor Max Müller,\* "the Goths made a raid from Europe to *Asia, Galatia, and Cappadocia*, and the *Christian captives*, whom they carried back to the Danube, were the first to spread the light of the Gospel among the Goths." *This short sentence carries Benjamin half-way to Britain.* The state of Central Europe during the succeeding years was such that it is impossible actually to trace them further. Any one looking at a map of the migrations of the Alans, Huns, Vandals, &c., at this period, will see this fact, and also how easily, in the unsettled state of the country, these rearmost ranks of the Israelites may have crossed the continent.

One of many statements, which puzzled me for a long time, was the assertion that Benjamin joined the other Tribes of Israel by ship through the Mediterranean. I used to suppose that the Roman navy was supreme on that central sea, and that Benjamin must therefore have come, little by little, as passengers in the Roman vessels. Quite recently, however, a most striking solution of this difficulty occurred to me, in an historical event which I have already described. It is the marvellous expedition of the Franks and Saxons, or Saxons alone, recorded in the history of the settlement of Israel on the German Ocean. These, transplanted from their homes by Probus in the year 270, were located by him *in the very place where captive Benjamin and the other Christians had been carried only three years*

\* *Lectures on the Science of Language*, Series I., p. 188.

*before.* And when, ten years later, these transplanted Franco-Saxons, made themselves masters of many vessels, and left the shores of the Black Sea, may it not easily have happened that a portion at least of the Christian captives of A.D. 267 made their escape with them? This one fact would carry Benjamin the rest of the way, to the country where the other Tribes were already settled, and that too, as had been surmised, by ship.

*The discovery of Benjamin in the Normans*—those particular "Normans," that is to say, who entered Britain in 1066—is one of the most wonderful points in the whole story of Israel in Britain; and history gives many striking coincidences tending to confirm this belief.

"Northmen" or "*Normans*" was simply a name given to successive bands of adventurers from Scandinavia as they reached the countries of the south. *It was not the name of a race.* Thus the "Norman" founder of the Muscovite Empire was not of the same race as the Normans who entered England; and we are violating no fact of race in supposing that in these we have the union of Benjamin, the last of the Tribes of Israel, with the rest of Israel, already in Britain. In Creasy's *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World* the following dates are given:—

"911. The French king cedes Neustria to Hrolf the Northman. *He and his army of Scandinavian warriors become the ruling class of the population of the province, which is called after them, Normandy.*

"1016. Four knights from Normandy, *who had been on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land,* while returning through Italy, head the people of Salerno in repelling an attack of a band of Saracen corsairs. In the next year many adventurers from Normandy settle in Italy where they conquer Apulia (1040) and afterwards Sicily (1060)."

"*Benjamin shall ravine as a wolf.*" "*The beloved of the Lord.*" Nothing can be a more complete commentary on these words than the history of those Normans whose entrance into England completed the English nation. Let us listen to the words of Lord Macaulay:—"The Normans were then *the foremost race of Christendom.* Their *valour* and *ferocity* had made them conspicuous among the rovers whom Scandinavia had sent forth to ravage Western Europe. Their sails were long the terror of both coasts of the Channel. Their arms were repeatedly carried far into the heart of the Carolingian empire, and were victorious under the walls of Maestricht and Paris. At length one of the feeble heirs of Charlemagne ceded to the strangers a fertile province (Normandy). *Without laying aside the dauntless valour,* which had been the terror of every

land from the Elbe to the Pyrenees, *the Normans rapidly acquired all, and more than all, the knowledge and refinement which they found in the country where they settled. . . . That chivalrous spirit which has exercised so powerful an influence on the politics, morals, and manners of all the European nations, was found in the highest exaltation among the Norman nobles. . . . But their chief fame was derived from their military exploits. Every country, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Dead Sea, witnessed the prodigies of their discipline and valour. One Norman knight, at the head of a handful of warriors, scattered the Celts of Connaught. Another founded the monarchy of the Two Sicilies, and saw the emperors both of the East and of the West fly before his arms.*"

The proximity of so remarkable a people to England naturally produced a great effect there. Alliances were effected, and gradually the ties between the Saxons and the Normans were drawn closer. At length, in 1066, came the Battle of Hastings, fitly described as *one of the decisive battles of the world*; for it was this which realized the union of Israel in the Isles of the West. Thus, about 2000 years after the loan to Judah, Benjamin entered upon its proper position as part of the Kingdom of Israel.

The view here presented, as to the particular Normans who entered Britain in 1066, is not at all affected by the question of the Israelitish origin of the modern Norwegians. It is no doubt the case that the name "Normans" or "Northmen" included the Danes, who formed the last immigration but one of Israel into Britain. Whether Benjamin went from the Black Sea to the German Ocean across the continent of Europe, or by the Mediterranean Sea, for the last five centuries before the advent of the "Normans" into England, the Benjamites would be associating with the other Tribes, either in Saxony, or in Scandinavia; and those particular "Normans" who entered England — probably also those who became famous for exploits in Italy and Palestine — were of the Tribe of Benjamin. The cognizance of the Dukes of Normandy was a *wolf*. The special characteristics of Benjamin, "to rovin like a wolf" and "the beloved of the Lord," are applicable in a marked degree to those Normans; while the Saxons, like the earlier Scüths, fulfilled to the letter the predicted part of "the remnant of Jacob among the Gentiles." This explanation will probably set at rest a difficulty, which has perhaps occurred to more than one.





## CHAPTER XVII.

### ISRAEL IN BRITAIN.

*Britain freed from its French dominions—Formation of the British Nation—Fighting against great odds—Israel's political destiny finally worked out—Ephraim and Manasseh—Manasseh in America—Joseph's blessings—Conclusion.*

**A**LL the component parts of the future Nation of Israel have now been traced into their "little sanctuary" in the "Isles of the West," the home where it was foretold that they should "renew their strength." But there was work still remaining to be done, before Israel could develop its true character. The Norman kings ruled a great part of France. These dominions had to be given up. Lord Macaulay saw this clearly, when he pointed out that, if the Plantagenets had, as at one time seemed likely, succeeded in uniting all France under their government, it is probable that England would never have had an independent existence, thereby indefinitely retarding the formation of the British Nation. The English language would have remained a rustic dialect, without a literature, a fixed grammar, or a fixed orthography. The only pathway to distinction would have been the adoption of the speech and habits of France. Such are some of the calamitous results which would, in all human probability, have ensued, had not Normandy been separated from England.

Sir E. Creasy also bears testimony to the truth of this view. The time has come, he says—referring to the period when the nation was being formed—when the Saxon and the Norman at length "feel that they are all one people, and have learned to unite their efforts for the common purpose of protecting the rights and promoting the welfare of all. The fortunate loss of the Duchy of Normandy in John's reign greatly promoted these new feelings. Thenceforth our Barons' only homes were in England. One language had, in the

reign of Henry III., become the language of the land ; and that, also, had then assumed the form in which we still possess it. One law, in the eye of which all freemen are equal without distinction of race, was modelled, and steadily enforced, and still continues to form the groundwork of our judicial system."

Thus it is evident that the history of the British nation, as the occupants of these British Isles, commences with the severance of Normandy from England. Then it was, in the words of Lord Macaulay, "*that the national character began to exhibit those peculiarities which it has ever since retained, and that our fathers became emphatically islanders—islanders not merely in geographical position, but in their politics, their feelings, and their manners.* Then first appeared with distinctness that constitution which has ever since, through all changes, preserved its identity ; that constitution of which all the other free constitutions in the world are copies, and which, in spite of some defects, deserves to be regarded as the best under which any great society has ever yet existed during many ages. *Then it was that the courage of those sailors, who manned the rude barks of the Cinque Ports, first made the flag of England terrible on the seas. Then was formed that language,*" which is destined to be the medium of communication between all the races of the world.

"Early in the fourteenth century"—these are still the words of Lord Macaulay—"the amalgamation of the races was all but complete ; and it was soon made manifest, by signs not to be mistaken, that a people inferior to none existing in the world" had arisen in Britain. Poitiers, where 8000 *British* completely routed 80,000 *French*, and Agincourt, won by 10,000 *British* against 100,000, tell their own tale. What other nation has ever fought successfully against such odds as these ? Britain did so then, and has done so again and again since. This was one of the promises to Israel.

The two final events in the working out of Israel's political destiny, came to pass within a few years of one another. One was the union of Scotland and England under one crown, whereby the whole nation *returned to its allegiance* to the House of David. The other was the sailing of the Pilgrim Fathers from the shores of Britain, to find a new home on the other side of the Atlantic. The significance of this latter event I proceed to show at length. Once more I ask the reader to accompany me to the bedside of the dying Jacob. Thus the story reads :—

"It came to pass, after these things, that one told Joseph, Behold, thy father is sick : and he took with him his two sons,

Manasseh and Ephraim. And one told Jacob, and said, Behold, thy son Joseph cometh unto thee: and Israel strengthened himself, and sat upon the bed. And Jacob said unto Joseph, God Almighty appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, and said unto me, Behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will make of thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession. And now thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, which were born unto thee in the land of Egypt before I came unto thee in Egypt, are mine; as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine. And thy issue, which thou begetttest after them, shall be thine, and shall be called after the name of their brethren in their inheritance.

"And Israel beheld Joseph's sons, and said, Who are these? And Joseph said unto his father, They are my sons, whom God hath given me in this place. And he said, Bring them, I pray thee, unto me, and I will bless them. Now the eyes of Israel were dim for age, so that he could not see. And he brought them near unto him; and he kissed them, and embraced them. And Israel said unto Joseph, I had not thought to see thy face; and, lo, God hath showed me also thy seed. And Joseph took them both, Ephraim in his right hand toward Israel's left hand, and Manasseh in his left hand toward Israel's right hand, and brought them near unto him. *And Israel stretched out his right hand, and laid it upon Ephraim's head, who was the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh's head, guiding his hands wittingly; for Manasseh was the first born.* And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth. *And when Joseph saw that his father laid his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, it displeased him: and he held up his father's hand to remove it from Ephraim's head unto Manasseh's head. And Joseph said unto his father, Not so, my father: for this is the first-born; put thy right hand upon his head. And his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.* And he blessed them that day, saying, In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh: *and he set Ephraim before Manasseh.*"\*

\* Gen. xlviii.

"Ephraim before Manasseh"—the younger before the elder. Why? "That the purpose of God according to *election* might stand." The promise of multitudinous increase, given to Abraham, was not extended to all Abraham's descendants; but, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." Isaac had two sons. The *younger* was chosen. Jacob had twelve sons; but it was in Joseph that this promise was to be fulfilled. Nor did Joseph's elder son inherit first, for "he set Ephraim before Manasseh." Of Ephraim was to come a multitude of nations—the "nation and company of nations" promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Of Manasseh was to come another nation, and that a great one; but not so great as Ephraim's multitude. If, therefore, the "nation and company of nations" be found in the British Empire, then must there be existing now a nation of Manasseh, severed from the main body of Israel, and approximating in greatness to the empire of Ephraim. Reader, can you not think of a nation so related to the British Empire? If not, listen to one more passage of Holy Writ. Listen to this message of comfort to Israel, sent from Jehovah through the mouth of His prophet Isaiah :

"Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold : all these gather themselves together, and come to thee. As I live, saith the Lord, thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with an ornament, and bind them on thee, as a bride doeth. For thy waste and desolate places, and the land of thy destruction, shall even now be *too narrow by reason of the inhabitants*, and they that swallowed thee up shall be far away. The children which thou shalt have, *after thou hast lost the other*, shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me : give place to me, that I may dwell."\*

"After thou hast lost the other." "The place is too strait for me : give place to me, that I may dwell." *The loss of children, followed by the sending-out still of colonies*, as outlets for the surplus population of the mother country. Such is the picture here delineated. I ask, is there not now existing a great State, originally a colony of Britain, now independent of the British Crown? There is such a state, but only one such state. There is only one colony which has been "lost" to Britain. The great American Republic is, obviously, the nation foretold to come of Manasseh's seed. Its founders, the Pilgrim Fathers, were of Manasseh. Its growing greatness, its increasing population, are due to the element in it of Manasseh. And Manasseh has yet to form a portion of the great confederated Empire owning the sway of the throne of the House of David.

\* Isaiah xlix. 18—20.

"Joseph is a fruitful bough, a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches (*Heb.* daughters) run over the wall. The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him. But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob (*henceforth he is keeping the Stone of Israel* \*); even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breast and of the womb. The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills. They shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren."†

The foregoing is Jacob's blessing. The following is that of Moses, delivered four centuries later.

"And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath, and for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills, and for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof, and for the good-will of Him that dwelt in the bush. Let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of an unicorn. With them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth. And they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh."‡

The nineteenth century, marked as it has been by such wonderful accessions of knowledge in all its branches, is fast drawing to a close. Foremost among the knowledge gained is that of the earth's surface, and of the nations its inhabitants. Of the habitable globe well nigh every corner has by this time been explored. There are left only a few tribes, in the equatorial regions of Africa, who have not been reached by the emissaries of civilization, or the missionaries of the Gospel of God. All the mighty nations of the earth are known. All the nations, which have any immediate prospect of becoming mighty, are known. Where, then, shall we, before whose

\* Not "from thence is the Shepherd," but "henceforth he takes care of" (נִשְׁמָר), same word as in Gen. xxix. 9, 'kept') "the stone of Israel" (*viz.*, of Jacob).

† Gen. xlix. 22—26.

‡ Deut. xxxiii. 13—17.

eyes the signs of the approaching end are daily multiplying, who see nations rising against other nations in the pursuance of imagined rights, who hear of wars in abundance, of rumours of wars without ceasing, of national troubles increasing in severity, of famines each more fearful than the last, of pestilences, of great earthquakes in divers places—where, I ask, among the nations of the earth, shall we look for the “ten thousands of Ephraim” and “thousands of Manasseh,” for the “fruitful bough of Joseph,” blessed with so many and such eminent blessings,—where, if not in the British Folk?


Reader, would you know the truth of this great question, the mere asking of which comes like a new revelation in an age when men say, “Where is the promise of His coming; for, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation”? For my own part, if the light I have been permitted to throw on history hitherto obscure has carried conviction to your mind, I am glad, and give God the glory. But, for yourself, I have a further work to recommend. Be not ashamed, I pray you, to do as the Bereans did, when Paul told them of Messiah come. They “*searched the Scriptures daily, to see if those things were so.*” Do you, then, the same, with your eyes open, with your *heart* ready to understand, with your mind freed from the fetters of traditional comments; and I doubt not you will shortly begin to realize the glories attaching to this great apokalypse of

ISRAEL IN BRITAIN.



---

## CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY.







## CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF ISRAEL'S WANDERINGS.

**I**N order to enable the reader to grasp with greater ease the bearing of the different historical facts set forth in the present essay, I have prepared a tabulated statement, exhibiting in chronological order the events from the captivity of Israel up to the entrance into Britain of the last section of the Israelite race. By no means the least in importance are the victories of Israel over the great heathen empires. These I have duly chronicled. The victories over Rome are indicated by a Roman numeral placed after the notice of the battle—thus, the first victory of Israel over Rome is marked I., the second II., &c. There is one fact which is shewn very clearly in the tabulated statement, and which should never be lost sight of in this matter of Israel. It is that Israel's captivity preceded by two centuries and a-half the flourishing period of Greek history, and by nearly five centuries the epoch of the rise of the Roman power. Israel vanished long before Greece and Rome grew famous. And from the captivity to the first entrance of the Saxons into Britain was a period considerably over 1000 years.

In perusing the table, it must be observed that each pair of pages presents two synchronous columns of events; so that the two must be read together, and in the order of the dates of the adjacent columns of dates.

THE REMNANT THAT ESCAPED.	DATE.
(Read both pages together.) First Invasion of	B.C. 771
The Escape of the Maritime portions of Israel commences.	
First Immigration into Ireland. The <b>DANNANS</b> ,	770
Escape of Maritime Israel completed.	
Immigrations into Ireland through Spain, during a period of about thirty years. The <b>SCOTS</b> .	730
Canaanite Immigrations frequent during the same period.	
Gradual settlement of Ireland during the seventh century B.C., and rise of four kingdoms:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ulster, founded by the Israelites.</li> <li>2. Leinster.</li> <li>3. Munster,</li> <li>4. Connaught,</li> </ol>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Munster,</li> <li>4. Connaught,</li> </ol>	} founded by Canaanites.
Gradual settlement of Gaul and parts of Spain during the seventh, sixth,	700
and fifth centuries B.C., by the Canaanites. They become known as	
<b>GAULS</b> or <b>KELTS</b> . With these, such of the escaped Israelites as	
did not take part in the immigrations into Ireland, remain for a time	
mixed up.	

DATE.	THE TRIBES OF THE CAPTIVITY.
B.C. 771	Israel by Assyria.
750	A body of Israelites abandon their country, and, taking their flocks and herds with them, reach the shores of the Black Sea. These are the <b>KIMMERIANS</b> .
740	First Captivity.
721	Second Captivity.
714	Successful revolt of the Medes from Assyria.  Six years of anarchy ensue.
	Concentration of the Israelites in the country intervening between the north of Media, and the river Araxes.
708	First king of Media. During his reign the Assyrians repeatedly attempt to recover their supremacy. Alliance between Israel and the Medes.
686	The Kimmerians make an irruption into Asia Minor, and kill Gyges, king of Lydia.
655	The supremacy of the Medes secured.
	<b>MIGRATION OF ISRAEL INTO EUROPE.</b>
	Two brief accounts of this remain— (1) by Ezra ; (2) by Herodotus.
	<i>Israel found in the SCÜTHS of Herodotus.</i>
654	The Scüths reach Arsareth, the land of the Kimmerians, on the north-west of the Black Sea.
	The Kimmerians retire, and invade Asia Minor. They overrun the whole country, and acquire a supremacy which they hold for upwards of thirty years.
628	An army of Scüths invade Media, and become masters of Media, Assyria, Babylonia, and the neighbouring countries. Their empire in Asia continues 28 years.
623	Birth of Sakya Muni, the founder of Buddhism. He descended from a section of the Ten Tribes, which had wandered off eastward from Media, and passed into Turkestan. There they became known as <b>SAKAI</b> . They become prominent in the history of Asia, especially of India, and survive in the Pathans of modern Afghanistan, and parts of Hindûstân. ( <i>See note, p. 144.</i> )
620	The Kimmerians expelled from Asia Minor about this time. They keep possession of Sinope, while the greater part return to the main body of the nation of Israel on the north-west of the Black Sea.

THE REMNANT THAT ESCAPED.	DATE.
Eochaidh, King of Ulster, elected Heremon, or High King, of all Ireland.	B. C. 600
Jeremiah, Baruch, and "the King's daughters" escape from Judah into Egypt. A prophet, accompanied by one Simon Brug, and having in his charge a "Princess from the East"—Tea Tephi—appears at the court of Eochaidh. Marriage of Eochaidh and Tea Tephi, thereby continuing the throne of David over Israel. Abolition of Baal-worship, and Tara chosen as the capital of Ireland.	580
General movement of the Kelts from south-east France, across the Alps into Italy.	450
With the last of these cross a body of Israelites, known as KIMBRI, or KYMRY. Their leader is named Brennus.	400
They exterminate the Etruscans in the plains of the Po, and in the year march on Rome.	390
Battle of the Allia.      I.	
Rome destroyed by fire.	
During the succeeding century these same Kymrian "Gauls" overrun Italy.	
Advance of Kymric-Israel from north Italy, through Bosnia and Servia, into Macedonia. They defeat and slay Ptolemy Keraunus, the successor of Alexander the Great.	279
ISRAEL VICTORIOUS OVER MACEDON.	
Checked at Delphi, they cross the Hellespont into Asia, and occupy the country called after them Galatia, where they defeat and slay Antiochus I., the successor of Alexander in Syria.	278 261
ISRAEL AGAIN VICTORIOUS OVER MACEDON.	
The Galatians gradually become a terror throughout Asia.	
A band of Galatians ( Kymric - Israel ) cross the Black Sea	250
About this period the Israelites still remaining among the Canaanites in Gaul, concentrate in the country between the rivers Seine and Rhine, where they become known as BELGÆ.	

DATE.	THE TRIBES OF THE CAPTIVITY.
C 600	Termination of the Scythic empire in Asia. The expelled Scythians rejoin the main body of Israel.
	United Israel gradually consolidate an Empire, extending over the modern Moldavia, Bulgaria, and the southern provinces of Russia—from the Black Sea to the Baltic.
	<i>Simultaneous rise of the Babylonian Empire.</i>
559	<i>Rise of the Persian Empire.</i>
508	Darius, the Persian Emperor, invades Israel in Scythia.
507	He retires defeated.
	ISRAEL VICTORIOUS OVER PERSIA.
450	Visit of Herodotus, the Greek historian, to Scythia.
	<i>Lost Israel, 270 years after their captivity, described by an eye-witness.</i>
350	The GÉTAI, who at the time of Darius were the southern vanguard of Scythic-Israel, occupying the modern Bulgaria, retired about this period to the north of the Danube, where they are later known as DAKIANS.
331	<i>Rise of the Empire of Macedon.</i>
291	Dromichaetes, king of the Gétai, defeats and takes prisoner Lysimachus, the successor of Alexander in Thrace, who had invaded his territory.
	ISRAEL VICTORIOUS OVER MACEDON.
	<i>(Read both pages together.)</i>
250	into Scythia, and intermarry with Scythic-Israel.

THE REMNANT THAT ESCAPED.	DATE.
	B.C.
<p>The Belgic Kimbri (Israel of the remnant that escaped) are the only obstacle to the victorious career of the Scüthic Kimbri (Israel of the Tribes of the Captivity).</p>	104
<p>Approximate date of the crossing of the Belgæ, or KYMRY, into Britain.</p>	100
<p>Gradual occupation by them of the whole of South Britain.</p>	
<p>The Israelite Scots of North Ireland make expeditions to the opposite coasts of Britain, and settle permanently in the portion of Scotland called Argyll.</p>	
<p>(Read both pages together.)</p> <p>BIRTH OF THE</p>	A.D. 1

DATE.	THE TRIBES OF THE CAPTIVITY.
B.C.	
115	Mithridates, king of Pontus, comes into contact with Scüthic-Israel.
114	<b>FIRST MIGRATION WEST.—THE KIMBRI.</b>
	Leaving Roumania, the Kimbri advance along the Danube and the Drave, and appear on the north-east frontier of Italy.
113	<b>Battle of Norria. II.</b>
	Passing through Switzerland, they reach the Roman dominions in Gaul.
109 } 107 }	Victories over Rome. III. and IV.
105	<b>Battles of Arausio. V., VI., and VII.</b>
104	Checked in Spain, they overrun the whole of Gaul, except the territory of the Belgæ.
103	They return through Switzerland, and, descending through the Tyrol, advance on Italy.
102	Victory over Rome. VIII.
101	Complete defeat of the Kimbri by the Roman General Marius.
100	The remnants of the Kimbri and of their allies, the Teutones, cross the upper Danube, and advance down the valley of the Elbe, into Denmark.
	<b>SECOND MIGRATION WEST.</b>
	An offshoot from Scüthia crosses the Vistula, and then divides. One portion penetrates across the Baltic into Sweden, where they become known as <b>GOTHS</b> (i.e., Scüths, with the initial letter lost). The other portion settles on the Elbe.
50	The settlers on the Elbe become known as <b>CHERUSCI.</b>
10	A Roman expedition into Dacia retires defeated. IX.
	Boerebistas, a leader of the Dakians or Getae, establishes a powerful dominion. He becomes formidable to the Romans, and, crossing the Danube, devastates Thrace, and annihilates the Boii and Taurisci.
A.D.	
1	<b>REDEEMER OF ISRAEL.</b>
	Scüthia, at this period, extends from the Dniepr in Russia to the Theiss, a tributary of the Danube, in Hungary. It thus lies on both sides of the Carpathian Mountains. Its occupants are variously known as Scüths or Dakians.
	Embassy from the Kimbri and Teutones in Denmark to Augustus.
9	Q. Varus and three legions are completely defeated by Arminius, the leader of Cheruscan-Israel, in the decisive
	<b>Battle of the Saltus Teutoburgensis. X.</b>
15 } 16 }	Germanicus defeated by Arminius. XI. and XII.





DATE.	THE TRIBES OF THE CAPTIVITY.
A D.	
70	Irruption of the Dakian Scüths into Moesia, where they defeat the Roman Legate, Fonteius Agrippa. XIII.
86	Deke-bal, the leader of the Dakians, defeats Fuscus, the lieutenant of the Roman Emperor, Domitian. XIV.
	Throughout this century the Dakians are a constant source of terror to Rome.
100	Trajan invades Dacia. The Dakians give way step by step.
105	Scüthia west and south of the Carpathians abandoned. The Dakians retire to the country between the Carpathians and the Dniepr.
141	The name <b>SAXONS</b> known to Ptolemy.
200	Birth of <b>ODIN</b> .
250	<b>LAST WESTWARD MIGRATION OF THE SCÜTHS.</b>
	Odin leads a multitude of Scüths, called specially <b>ÄSIR</b> , from Äsgard on the Dniepr to the Elbe. He first goes north into Gardarike or Russia, then west, across the Vistula, into Germany. This movement precipitates the German and Sarmatian tribes on to the Roman Empire. Crossing the Elbe he peoples Saxony, thus causing the great increase in the power of the Saxons which was manifested shortly after this time. Odin next passes into Sweden, where he finds people of the Scüthic race already settled. Here he dies.
267	The Goths, driven by Odin's advance from their settlements on the Vistula, move southward, and occupy the territory vacated by the Scüths. They make a raid across the Black Sea into Asia Minor, and carry captive the Christian population.
280	Saxons, who had been settled on the Black Sea by the Emperor Probus; period of disorder in Central Europe.
	<b>NORTHMEN or NORMANS.</b>
300	The Saxons at the height of their power. The country occupied by Israel at this time extends from the Rhine, on the South, to the centre of Sweden, on the North. Here the Israelites are variously known as <b>SAXONS, JUTES, KIMBRI, ANGLI, and DANES.</b>
448	<b>FIRST MIGRATION INTO BRITAIN.</b>
	From this period there are frequent immigrations, forming <i>Eight Independent States</i> , corresponding to the number of the Tribes carried captive. Over and above these are some representatives of the colony of <b>DAN-ites</b> in the north of Palestine.
	<i>The Germans are not of Israel.</i>
900	The Normans occupy the north of France.
1066	<b>ENTRANCE OF BENJAMIN INTO BRITAIN.</b>
	<b>FORMATION OF THE BRITISH NATION.</b>

## NOTE ON THE DATE OF SAKYA-MUNI (BUDDHA).

I append an interesting extract from the report, contained in the *Times* of Friday, May 20th, 1881, of the fourth of the series of "Hibbert Lectures" for the current year. They are delivered by Mr. Rhys Davids, and the subject is, *The Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by Buddhism*. The date of Buddha's birth indicated in this fourth lecture is about a century later than the date assigned on other evidence in my essay. The extract is as follows :

"Gotama" (*i.e.*, Sakya-Muni, or Buddha) "was born in a village in the Ganges valley, at the foot of the Himalaya mountains, and about 100 miles north of the great river ; his father being, not a king, but a petty rajah, the head of a comparatively unimportant clan, called the *Sakyas*. The exact date of his birth is not quite certain, the oldest authority on that point, the *Dipāvansa*, containing conflicting statements as to the interval which elapsed between the time of Gotama and that of the well-known Buddhist monarch Asoka ; but it can be fixed *between the middle and the end of the 6th century B.C.*" For particulars we are referred to the lecturer's *Handbook of Buddhism*.

---

## APPENDIX.





## APPENDIX.

---

### I. DAN OMITTED FROM THE SEALING OF THE 144,000 OF ALL THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL.

**I**N the seventh chapter of Revelation is recorded the following command of Jehovah, given by the mouth of an angel having the Seal of the living God : " Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads." The "servants" of Jehovah here in the closing book of the New Testament, as in the prophecies of the Old, are Israel. And of the tribes of Israel sections are here commanded to be preserved by sealing from impending temporal woes, from the power of "the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea." Judah (dispersed since the Roman siege), Reuben, Gad, Asher, Naphthali, Manasseh, Simeon, Levi, Issachar, Zebulon, Joseph (that is, Ephraim), Benjamin—all are included in the Sealing. But *Dan is omitted*. Why? Ideas the most far-fetched have been put forward by commentators in answer to this question. The light of *Israel in Britain*, and it alone, supplies the true answer. The impending woes were the successive onslaughts of the barbarians on the Roman Empire, during the last century-and-a-half of its existence. During that period Central Europe was in a state of worse than anarchy.

Nation was fighting against nation. Nations were combining to fight against the Roman power in the West and in the East. But it was through Central Europe that Israel's path to Britain lay. And the purpose of the Sealing was to preserve a section of each tribe during a period of terrible disturbance and danger. But *Dan had no need of this safeguard*. The thousands of Dan had long been

safe in the happy Isles of the West, safe entirely from the woes which threatened the countries where his brethren of the other tribes were located. For them there was every need of the safeguarding Seal of the God of Israel.

This explanation, which now seems to me the only possible one, certainly the only satisfactory one yet presented, was shown clearly to me by the author of *Israel in Britain* and *The Berwick Lectures*; to whom I am indebted for a careful revision of my proofs for the press, as well as for many valuable suggestions, more especially the notes to which his initials (C.M.) are appended. Had I been earlier shown this matter of Dan, omitted, I should have presented one of the chapters of my first part in a slightly different shape. The chapter which is headed "Dan and Simeon in the Isles of the West," would have been "Dan in the Isles of the West." Simeon escaped from the captivity, but did not, as a body, share in the migrations into Ireland. "Kymric Israel among the Gentiles" is the chapter which treats of the fortunes of Simeon. They are there traced *back* from west to east, through South Europe, till they find a resting-place in Galatia. Thence, in company with Benjamin, they pass into Central Europe; and, therefore, they, in common with the other tribes, were in need of the Sealing.

The historical application of different portions of the Apokalypse to Israel in exile is set in a clear light by the following passages in one of *The Berwick Lectures*, which, with the permission of the author, I extract, and incorporate here. At the same time I most earnestly advise the reader to peruse the whole of *The Berwick Lectures*, if possible, for himself, for they contain much important matter, and that in brief compass. They are reprinted in *The Heir of the World* (New York) for January to May, 1880. The extract is as follows:—

"In Daniel it is written, 'It shall be for a time, times, and a-half. And when he shall have accomplished to spread abroad' (in our version 'scatter') 'the power of the Holy People' (that is Israel, who are appointed to be 'a kingdom of priests, a holy nation,' Exod. xix. 6) 'all these things shall be finished' (Dan. xii. 7). The prophetic 'time' is 360 years.  $360 + (2 \times 360) + 3\frac{1}{2}^0 = 1260$  years (that is, solar years, of  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days).

"In the Apokalypse (xii.) of John, which is the amplification and completion of the vision of Daniel, we read again of Israel, the divorced woman, thus—There appeared 'a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of

twelve stars' (the twelve tribes). 'And she brought forth a man-child' (the Messias) 'who was to rule all nations with a *Rod of Iron*, and her child was caught up unto God, and to His throne. And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a *place prepared* of God, that they should *feed her there* a thousand two hundred and threescore days ;" that is, again, 1260 years.

"Observe very particularly that she fled into the *wilderness*, where a place is specially *prepared*, that she may be fed. The wilderness is not a place where we should expect to be fed. But if a place be prepared, that is another matter. Now, by the mouth of Isaiah (xxxv. 1, 2) we are told precisely and literally what is the kind of place prepared—'The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them' (observe the exquisite beauty of the diction), 'and the desert shall rejoice and *blossom as the rose*. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing.'

"Nay so much like their own *home* is it, that 'the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon. They shall *see* the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of *our* God.'

"Is it possible to conceive a more accurate and literal description of these 'Isles of the West,' these isles in which we live, these isles of the west to which, throughout, the prophecy is delivered? Is it true, or is it not true, that, when we first came hither, they were a wilderness and solitary place, a desert; and that now, by the goodness and long suffering of *our* God, they blossom as the rose, blossom abundantly?

"But this is not all. The Woman is 'clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet.' Precisely. It was so declared, by the mouth of Moses nearly 3400 years ago, that she should be (Deut. xxxiii.). 'Blessed be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath; and for the *precious fruits put forth by the SUN*, and for the *precious things put forth by the MOON*; and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills; and for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof.' 'They shall suck the abundance of the seas, and treasures hid in the sand.'

"It is not possible to describe with a finer precision the wealth of resource of our highly-favoured land, fruits, corn, pasture, iron, coal, harbours, fisheries; down to the gold in the sands of the colonial rivers. But it is a wealth of resource exceptional and unique in the world. There is elsewhere no parallel to it.

"But note also very specially that, for many reasons, it is demonstrable that this declaration by Moses could not refer merely to the possession of the Promised Land under the ancient kings, from the Exodus to Messias. For one reason, sufficient in itself, the children of Israel have *never yet* possessed the whole land promised to the fathers, from Euphrates to the Nile, but only a part of the territory; and that only in temporary holding. For another reason: in the first part of the declaration we read, 'Hear the voice of *Judah*, and bring him unto his people.' Manifestly, then, the time referred to is when the Jews are scattered through the world, and cut off from the rest of the tribes."

To this may be added that the *manner* in which the Woman is carried into the Wilderness precisely describes the historical migration of Israel to the Isles of the West. "There were given to the woman the two wings of The Great Eagle, that she might fly into the Wilderness." (Revised Version.) These are the Eastern and Western sections of the Roman Empire,\* by whose disturbed oscillations the Tribes were kept in motion. "The serpent cast out of his mouth after the woman water as a *river*, that he might cause her to be carried away by the *stream*. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed up the *river*." This is an exact description of the immense perturbed stream of the hordes that broke in upon Europe from north-west Asia, seeming to engulph in its currents and eddies the Tribes whose miraculous fortunes we have traced in the foregoing pages; leaving them at last high and dry upon the westernmost margin of the flood; whilst the main stream of the Gentile hordes was absorbed by the territories of Continental Europe.

The extract from the *Berwick Lectures* continues thus:—"We read in the Apokalypse xi. 2—4: 'The Holy City shall be trodden under foot *forty and two months*.' This is another variant form of expressing the same great prophetic period of 1260 years. 'And I will give unto my two *witnesses*, and they shall prophesy a *thousand two hundred and threescore days*.' This is again the same 1260 years that the Woman was to be fed in the wilderness. Who are the two witnesses? Israel and Judah. 'Ye are My witnesses, saith the Lord.' As for Judah, or the Jews, are they not the perpetual, ubiquitous witness to the literal truth of the 'sure *word* of pro-

\* If anyone doubt that The Great Eagle is the Roman Empire, let him turn to 2 Esdras, xi. and xii., where the Roman power is foretold in detail, under the form of an eagle which "spread her wings over all the earth."



phesy'? The two witnesses bear testimony 'clothed in sackcloth.' Because to Israel hath happened 'blindness in part,' having repented of their idolatry and taken the name of Christ, yet being ignorant of their heritage as Israel; and the Jews stand in the 'wailing-place' of the ages, having cut themselves off from Messias. Nevertheless, 'these are the two *olive-trees*, and the two candlesticks, standing before the God of the earth.' Here is the 'good olive-tree' spoken of by Paul (Rom. xi.). Here are the 'two olive-trees' seen in the vision of Zechariah, iv., 'the two anointed ones,' that is, 'the kingdom of priests,' that 'stand by the Lord of the whole earth,'—the very words repeated in the Apokalypse."

## II. THE RIVER ARAXES OF HERODOTUS.

In Chapter VI. I referred at length (pp. 51, 52,) to certain geographical statements made by Herodotus, and misunderstood by his commentators. Of these the greater part relate to a river named Araxes, connected with events recorded in the history as belonging to widely different periods. So important is it for the reader to see fully what Herodotus did say, that I insert the following translation of the passages concerned with the question, adding, where necessary, the words in the original language. The first series of passages is contained in Chapters 201 to 216 of Book I., and commences thus :—

(201). "Now when Cyrus had subjected the Babylonian nation, he further thought to put under him (the) Massagétai, a nation said to be both great (in numbers) and mighty, dwelling towards the east and the sun-rising, beyond the river Araxes (*πέραν τοῦ Ἀράξεω ποταμοῦ*), and over against men (known as) Issedones (*ἀντίον δὲ Ἰσσηδόνων ἀνδρῶν*). Moreover, some even say that this nation is Scüthic" (*Σκυθικόν*, *i.e.*, belonging to the great race known variously as Scüths or Sakai). Halikarnassus, the birthplace and early home of Herodotus, was situated in the south-west corner of Asia Minor. A glance at a map of Asia Minor and Armenia will show how accurate is his account of the situation of the Massagétai, supposing them to have occupied the plain between the mountains of Armenia and the Caucasus, a district lying almost due east of Halikarnassus, and "beyond the Araxes." The mention of the Issedones affords no certain indication of the situation of the Massagétai. They occur again in Book IV., Chapters 13, 16, 25—27, but from none of these passages can we be certain as to where they lived. They seem, most

probably, to have extended along the west shore of the Caspian, north of the Caucasus, to the river Ural; possibly further, to the southern spur of the Ural Mountains.

(202). "The Araxes is said to be both greater and less than the Danube. *They say* that islands frequently occur in it, in size about equal to Lesbos." Note the λέγεται and φάσι of these two statements. There is no question here of the veracity of Herodotus. Nevertheless, as foundation of these statements, there are, first, the fact that the Armenian river is of considerable length; and, secondly, the facts about the "islands," which I have given elsewhere (p. 51). After describing the inhabitants of the islands, as "they" had described them to him, Herodotus proceeds:—"Now, to resume, the Araxes rises in the Matienian [mountains] (ρέει μὲν ἐκ Ματινηνῶν sc. οὐρεων, as in I. 189, ἐπὶ Γύνδῃ ποταμῷ, τοῦ αἰ μὲν πηγαὶ ἐν Ματινηνοῖσι οὖρεσι), whence also flows the Gyndes" (referred to shortly before, I. 189. This was a tributary of the Tigris, rising in the south end of the mountain chain which separated Media from Assyria and, stretching northward between Media and Armenia, separated in its northern end the Euphrates and the Araxes); "and the mouths by which it empties itself are forty, of which all but one issue forth into pools (or marshes—ἐλεα) and shallows (τενάγεια, from τέναγος 'shoal water'). The (remaining) one mouth of the Araxes flows in a clear course (διὰ καθαροῦ) into the Caspian Sea." It is only necessary to look at the delineation of the delta of the united Kúr and Arás in Keith-Johnstone's *Royal Atlas*, to see that the description here given by Herodotus agrees minutely with the present aspect of the ground through which the modern Araxes flows into the Caspian. This point I have already insisted on (p. 51).

"Now the Caspian Sea is separated from the other sea (Mediterranean), the whole of which is navigated by the Greeks, and with which the Atlantic and Indian Ocean form one (continuous ocean).

(204). "The western shore of the Caspian Sea is bounded by the Caucasus. To the (shore) facing the east and the rising sun a plain succeeds, in extent without limit as far as the eye can reach (τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἥῳ τε καὶ ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα πεδῖον ἐκδέκεται πλῆθος ἄπειρον ἐς ἄποψιν). Of this great plain not-the-least (that is, the greater) portion is shared (with others) by the Massagétai (τοῦ ὧν δὴ πεδίου τοῦ μεγάλου οὐκ ἐλαχίστην μοῖρην μετέχουσιν οἱ Μασσαγέται), against whom Cyrus thought to march." Note that between the expedition of Cyrus and the time at

which Herodotus was writing there was an interval of about eighty years. He goes on in the following chapters to describe the expedition. "Cyrus," we are told (205), "advancing to the Araxes proceeded to make open war on the Massagétai, making a bridge over the river." So too (209) "he crossed the Araxes," and (211) "he advanced a day's march from the Araxes." Lastly, after narrating the disastrous end of the expedition of Cyrus, and reverting to his own times, Herodotus tells us (216) that "*the Massagétai live on fish, which are produced in abundance by the river Araxes.*"

There remain for consideration two passages in Book IV.

In chapter 11, after giving two mythical accounts of the origin of the Scüths, Herodotus proceeds as follows: But there is "another account, to which I myself incline—an account common to both Greeks and Barbarians (end of ch. 12). It is that the *nomad Scüths, dwelling (at that time) in Asia, being hard-pressed in war by (the) Massagétai, crossed the river Araxes and came* (literally, *had gone, were off*) *to the Kimmerian land* (Σκύθας τοὺς νομάδας, οἰκέοντας ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ, πολέμῳ πεισθέντας ὑπὸ Μασσαγέτων, οἴχεσθαι διαβάντας ποταμὸν Ἀράξια ἐπὶ γῆν τὴν Κιμμερίην.); the land now (*i.e.* B.C. 450) occupied by (the) Scüths being said to have formerly belonged to (the) Kimmerians." There can be no doubt that the river Araxes here mentioned in connection with the Massagétai is the same as that mentioned in the same connection at the close of Book I., that is, the modern Arás of Armenia.

The remaining passage (IV. 40) proves conclusively that the Araxes of Book IV. is the Araxes of Book I. The words in the original are these:—τὰ δὲ κατύπερθε Περσέων, καὶ Μήδων, καὶ Σασπείρων, καὶ Κόλλων, τὰ πρὸς ἡῷ τε καὶ ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα, ἐνθεν μὲν ἡ Ἐρυθρὴ παρήκει θάλασσα πρὸς βορέῳ δέ ἡ Κασπίη τε θάλασσα, καὶ ὁ Ἀράξης ποταμὸς, ῥέων πρὸς ἡλίον ἀνίσχοντα. That is:—"As to the parts beyond the Persians, Medes, Saspirians, and Colchians" (four nations described in IV. 37, as situated approximately in a line from south to north)—"the parts lying towards the east and the rising sun—on the one hand (*i.e.* to the south) stretches the Indian Ocean" (which, and not our Red Sea, was the Ἐρυθρὴ θάλασσα of ancient geographers); "on the north are the Caspian Sea, and the *river Araxes, flowing towards the rising sun.*" The direction of the course of the Araxes, implied of necessity in the previous description (I. 202), is here definitely stated. It stands to reason that one river is referred to

throughout. The strange surmises of the commentators argue the complete absence, on their part, of any adequate grasp of geographical facts. I will not repeat here the criticisms made by me in the text of my essay (pp. 51, 52); but will only ask the reader to peruse those pages side by side with the account given by Herodotus himself.

### III. THE RELIGION OF ODIN, FROM THE EDDA AND THE VÖLUSPA.

Whether it be the case or not that the historic Odin assumed a name which had already been long in use, it is certain that at an early period the name of Odin was attached to the Supreme Deity, from which it has too readily been inferred that Odin was merely the name given to their chief god by the old Saxons and Scandinavians. "In the system of the Northmen's religion," says Sharon Turner, "we see the great principles of the ancient theism, mingled with the additions of allegory, polytheism, and idolatry." There could hardly be a more significant corroboration of the Israelitish origin of Odin and the religion he brought from Eastern into Western Europe.

Odin is described in the Edda as the First of the gods. "He lives for ever: he governs all his kingdom, both the small parts and the great: he made heaven, and the earth, and the air; he made man, and gave him a spirit which shall live, even after the body shall have vanished."

There were some marvellous traditions preserved in the ancient *Völuspa*. One was, that the earth and heavens were preceded by a state of nonentity. "At the beginning of time there was nothing: neither land, nor sea, nor foundations below. The earth was nowhere to be found, nor the heaven above. There was an infinite abyss, and grass nowhere." Another, that at a destined period the earth and all the universe would be destroyed by fire. This catastrophe was connected with a being that was to direct it, whom they called Surtur, or the black one.

" All mankind  
Will disappear from the world.  
The sun darkens;  
The sea overwhelms the earth;  
The peaceful stars  
Vanish from the sky.  
Fire rages  
To the end of the age.  
The ascending flame  
Plays on the heavens."

Till this day Loki, the principle of evil, was to remain in the cave and chains of iron to which he was consigned. A new world is to emerge at this period. The good will be happy. The gods will sit in judgment, and the wicked will be condemned to a dreary habitation.

“ The powerful one will then come  
For the Divine judgment.  
The strong one from the realms above,  
Who governs all things.  
He brings the sentence,  
And determines the causes.  
He appoints the sacred destiny,  
Which will be fulfilled.  
Then will come the dim  
And flying dragon,  
The fierce serpent,”

the great serpent who is slain by Thor.

The Edda ends with another description of this final period, which presents it to us in a more detailed shape. “Snow will rush from all the quarters of the world. Three winters without a summer will be followed by three others, and then wars will pervade the whole world. Brother, father, son, will perish by each other’s hands. The wolf will devour the sun; another the moon. The stars will fall from heaven. The earth trembles. Mountains and trees are torn up. The sea rushes over the earth. Everything in heaven and earth is in fear. Thor kills the serpent, but dies also.”

For a most interesting account of the religion of Odin the reader should refer to Metcalfe’s *Englishman and Scandinavian*, from which I have extracted the following passages :—“Odin, on the one hand merges in the All-Father, the Supreme Author of everything existing, the Eternal, the Ancient of Days, the Living and Awful Being, the Being that never changeth, the God of Battle, the Searcher into hidden things.”\* “All through this striking drama,† be it observed, the benignant powers of Asgard, with Odin for their head, are assailed by the evil and malignant spirit, the sinister-minded power Loki, who had in days of yore been of one heart and one mind with the All-Father; nay, as the Edda says, had been his foster-brother. It was he who stole from the gods the apples of immortality.”‡ “There is surely little trace of a monk’s hand here. The tale is as fresh as if just come from the pine-woods of Skythia. . . . The way in which Odin rides the storm astride of his eight-footed horse, Sleipnir, leads us by comparison to think of him ‘who maketh the clouds His chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind.’§

\* p. 260.

† *The Völuspá*.

‡ p. 257.

§ p. 258.

I must not omit the passages in which the same writer points out the striking resemblance between the Edda and the Veda,\* between the religion of Odin and the religion of the Brahmans, hereby illustrating the connection between the Saxons of the East and of the West. "At every turn many resemblances may be traced between the Edda and the Rig-veda. The direct reference to worship of fire and the other great natural forces, the lightning, the wind, in the Veda re-appear in the Edda. . . . Again, in both there are clear traces of the recognition of a Supreme Being, an All-Father, of whom such gods as Indra and Odin and Thor are only manifestations. Those who know how deeply imbued the Northern people were with a love of genealogy will be interested to find that in his metrical recitations each day the Brahmin never omits his pedigree."†

"Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva possess attributes akin to those of the Scandinavian gods. Krishna destroying the serpent reminds us of Thor and his adventure with Midgardsorm. Those thousands of demons who infest Southern India, and are kept at bay by the several gods, reminiscences of the older Dravidian men who were conquered by the Aryan invaders, forcibly call to mind those giants (Jötuns) whom it was the business of Thor and other benign deities to subdue, but who were the remains, real or imaginary, of the old original inhabitants, invested by the people with supernatural attributes. When we hear of Brahma's body being divided, and the several members doing duty in another capacity among men . . . the Scandinavian student thinks of Hymer's becoming the sea, his flesh the earth, his bones rocks, his skull the arch of heaven."‡

\* May not these names be identical?

† p. 253.

‡ pp. 262, 3.



*The Weekly Organ of the Identity Movement,*

---

# THE MESSENGER.

A Weekly Journal devoted to the Elucidation of Prophecy  
and the Identification of the British Nation with the  
House of Israel, God's Chosen People.

---

**PRICE TWOPENCE WEEKLY.**

Or in Quarterly Parts at 2s. 8d.

---

*The Messenger specially advocates the fact that the British People are the descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel; and certifies that, by virtue of its Identity with Israel, our Nation is bound to inherit the very special favours God has promised to bestow upon Israel:*

THEREFORE—

No existing subject can be politically greater than this,

AND BY IT

Our Nation is seen to be positively fulfilling Prophecy day by day;

THEREFORE

No subject could be grander in a religious sense,

AND

No other subject opens up the Bible more to the understanding.

---

A FEW COPIES OF  
VOLUMES I. to V. OF THE MESSENGER

*Are still on Sale at 10s. 6d. each.*

They are invaluable as books of reference on all matters appertaining to the Identity of Britain with Israel, and form the only true record of the movement during the years 1880—4.

---

LONDON: JOHN HEYWOOD, 11, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS.  
SHEFFIELD: ANNIS UNWIN, 84, OXFORD STREET.

## WORKS ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF BRITAIN WITH ISRAEL.

---

*Ornamental Cloth, price 2s. 6d.*

**BATHSHEBA MONTSERRAT; OR, THE EXILE'S RETURN.**  
An Identity Story, by Mrs. M. A. SEARSON, Authoress of "The Sisters of Harrowdale Rectory."

---

*Price Twopence.*

**BRITAIN, THE STONE KINGDOM: A REFUTATION OF THE**  
REV. M. BAXTER'S FALLACIOUS EXPOSITIONS OF THE PROPHECIES, given in Two Lectures, in the Albert Hall, Sheffield, by JOHN UNWIN.

---

*Price Sixpence.*

**THE THRONE OF DAVID; OR, QUEEN VICTORIA,**  
A DESCENDANT OF DAVID, RULING OVER ISRAEL (THE BRITISH NATION), AND JACOB'S PILLOW (THE STONE OF BETHEL) THE BRITISH CORONATION STONE. A Lecture, delivered in the Masonic Hall, Lincoln, by J. M. W. YOUNG, Organist of Lincoln Cathedral and President of the Lincoln Anglo-Israel Association.

---

## PRIZE ESSAYS.

---

*Price Fourpence.*

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE EPISTLE FOR PRE-ADVENT SUNDAY.** A Prize Essay, reprinted from the "Messenger," showing the bearings of the Epistle upon the Identity of the British with the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel; with the reason why this Epistle is made compulsory to be read by the Clergy on this Sunday, without omission in any year. By WILLIAM PATTERSON ORCHARD.

*Price One Penny each, or 6s. per 100 for Distribution.*

**THE SECOND AND THIRD PRIZE ESSAYS ON THE SONG OF SIMEON.** Reprinted from the "Messenger."

---

## DR. WILD'S SERMONS.

---

*One Penny each, or 6s. per 100.*

**MR. SPURGEON AND THE LOST TEN TRIBES,** a Reply to the Rev. C. H. SPURGEON. **THE LAND, THE BOOK, AND THE PEOPLE,** a Discourse on the Identity. **THE POPE AND FREEMASONRY,** an Answer to the Papal Encyclical. And **THREE LIVES, THREE DEATHS, THREE SLEEPS.** Reprinted from the "Messenger."

---

LONDON: JOHN HEYWOOD, 11, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS.  
SHEFFIELD: ANNIS UNWIN, 84, OXFORD STREET.



## WORKS BY EDWARD HINE.

*Proving that the British Race are the Descendants of the  
Ten Lost Tribes of Israel.*

### FORTY-SEVEN IDENTIFICATIONS

OF THE BRITISH NATION WITH LOST ISRAEL.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

This vastly popular work gave the INSPIRATION to all Identity Writers of the present day. There is scarcely a trustworthy Identity thought put forth by others but what has been borrowed from this Book.

In it, there are not only conclusive proofs that the British are really Lost Israel, but it is proved that AMERICA IS IDENTICAL WITH MANASSEH.

This work has been read with much interest by members of the Royal Family, and has received the commendations of Prof. Piazza Smyth, Prof. Carpenter, Canon Brownrigg, Bishop Bond, Rev. Dr. Cumming, Dr. Wild, 'Philo-Israel,' and other eminent men.

**FLASHES OF LIGHT.** Being Part II. of the Forty-seven  
Identifications of the British Nation with the Lost House of Israel. Price 6d.,  
post free 7d.

**OXFORD WRONG**—in objecting to the English being Identical  
with Lost Israel : being Edward Hine's Replies to Canon Rawlinson, the British  
Association, Rev. R. A. Purdon, M.A., and Rev. J. R. Talbot, D.D. Price 4d.,  
post free, 5d.

**ENGLAND'S COMING GLORIES.** Price 6d., post free 7d.  
Being the Fourth Part of the "Identifications," showing the Coming Glory of  
the Outpouring of the Spirit ; of National Righteousness ; of Christian Union ;  
of God's Word Substantiated ; of "Moses and the Prophets ;" of the Overthrow  
of Infidelity ; of the Disuse of Preaching ; of Heaven-taught Pastors ; of the  
Exemption from War ; of Saving Millions ; of Righteous Taxation ; of Gathering  
the Jews ; of the Return Procession ; of the Ending of Sorrow ; of the Dividing  
of Waters ; of the English Language ; of Longevity ; of the Conversion of the  
Heathen, &c., &c.

**ANGLO-SAXON RIDDLE ; or the Riddle of our Origin,  
Present Greatness, and Future Grandeur.** By ANTIQUARY.  
Also, ITS SOLUTION. By EDWARD HINE. Price 2d., post free 2½d.

*The above works are also issued in one handsome volume, ornamental  
cloth, gilt edges, entitled*

### LOST ISRAEL FOUND.

*Price 3s. 6d. Post Free 3s. 9d.*

May be had direct of ISAAC LOVELAND, Shoreham, Sevenoaks,  
Kent, who has purchased the copyrights of Mr. Hine, and has engaged to  
pay to him a royalty of ten per cent. on all copies sold. Those desirous of  
assisting Mr. Hine would do well therefore to purchase and disseminate  
his publications.

LONDON : GUEST & Co., 29, PATERNOSTER ROW ; AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.





